

The JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY

VOL. II

NOVEMBER, 1936

No. 4



Published by *the* SOUTHERN
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME II

NOVEMBER, 1936

NUMBER 4

Published Quarterly by

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

E. MERTON COULTER
University of Georgia
THOMAS P. ABERNETHY
University of Virginia
RICHARD H. SHRYOCK
Duke University
JOHN D. BARNHART
Louisiana State University

FLETCHER M. GREEN
University of North Carolina
WILLIAM C. BINKLEY
Vanderbilt University
CHARLES S. SYDNOR
Duke University
WILLIAM O. LYNCH
Indiana University

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

President—CHARLES W. RAMSDELL, University of Texas
Vice-President—PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives
Secretary-Treasurer—FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

CONTENTS

<i>The Advance of Methodism into the Lower Southwest.</i> By Walter B. Posey	439
<i>Legal System of the Confederate States.</i> By William M. Robinson, Jr.	453
<i>Cincinnati's Reputation During the Civil War.</i> By Charles R. Wilson	468
<i>Jackson's "Rhea Letter" Hoax.</i> By Richard R. Stenberg	480
<i>Walter Lynwood Fleming: Historian of Reconstruction.</i> By Fletcher M. Green	497
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Hudson, <i>Humor of the Old Deep South</i> , by T. D. Clark	522
Dabney, <i>Universal Education in the South</i> , I, by Fremont P. Wirth	523
Paschal, <i>History of Wake Forest College</i> , I, by J. H. Easterby	525
Bond, <i>The Story of the Citadel</i> , by Richard Gabriel Stone	527
Heusinger, <i>Early Explorations and Mission Establishments in Texas</i> , by C. E. Castañeda	528
Gipson, <i>The British Empire before the American Revolution: Provincial Characteristics and Sectional Tendencies in the Era Preceding the American Crisis</i> , by Charles F. Strong	529
Janson, <i>The Stranger in America, 1793-1806</i> , by Philip Davidson	531
Arthur, <i>The Story of the West Florida Rebellion</i> , by I. J. Cox	532
Adams, <i>The Living Jefferson</i> , by William O. Lynch	532
Wiltse, <i>The Jeffersonian Tradition in American Democracy</i> , by William O. Lynch	532
Hendrick, <i>The Lees of Virginia; Biography of a Family</i> , by John Carter Matthews	534
Kellar, <i>Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist</i> , I, by Wendell H. Stephenson	535
Swisher, <i>Roger B. Taney</i> , by P. L. Rainwater	537
Jordan, <i>Letters of Eliab Parker Mackintire of Boston Written between 1845 and 1863, to Reverend William Salter of Burlington, Iowa</i> , by Dwight L. Dumond	539
Blegen, <i>The Civil War Letters of Colonel Hans Christian Heg</i> , by Charles R. Wilson	540
Williams, <i>General John T. Wilder, Commander of the Lightning Brigade</i> , by A. M. Stickles	542
Eckenrode and Conrad, <i>James Longstreet: Lee's War Horse</i> , by Haywood Pearce, Jr.	544
Case, <i>French Opinion on the United States and Mexico, 1860-1867; Extracts from the Reports of the Procureurs Généraux</i> , by E. Wilson Lyon	546
Hutchinson, <i>Cyrus Hall McCormick</i> , I and II, by E. L. Fox	547
Kenamer, <i>History of Jackson County, Alabama</i> , by A. W. Reynolds	549
<i>Today and Yesterday in the Heart of Virginia: A Reprint of the Edition of the Farmville Herald, March 29, 1935</i> , by Mary T. Armentrout	550
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	552
Personal	553
Historical Societies	554
Bibliographical	555
<i>Contributors</i>	563

The Advance of Methodism into the Lower Southwest

By WALTER B. POSEY

The treaty of San Lorenzo made with Spain in 1795 secured for the United States the territory on the left bank of the Mississippi River from Walnut Hills (Vicksburg) south to the thirty-first parallel. The Methodist Church with little delay entered this new region. At the South Carolina Conference held in Charleston January 1, 1799, Bishop Francis Asbury appointed Tobias Gibson, a twenty-nine year old preacher, as missionary to the Natchez country.¹

After a hard journey by land and water,² Gibson arrived in the Mississippi Territory sometime in the year 1799.³ Settlements had existed in this territory for almost a century but served for the most part as outposts of the French, Spanish, and English governments. A scattered population of eight thousand had been increased by the backwash from New Orleans—desperadoes and adventurers who for their own reasons avoided the larger town. Few of the settlers were thought to be seriously concerned with religion.⁴

¹ *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years 1773-1828* (New York, 1840), I, 83, 93; Nathan Bangs, *A History of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York, 1857), II, 81-82; George G. Smith, *The History of Methodism in Georgia and Florida from 1785-1865* (Macon, Georgia, 1877), 84.

² H. N. McTyeire, *A History of Methodism* (Nashville, 1884), 463; *Minutes*, I, 126.

³ Many accounts give the year as 1800. Jones possessed family records showing that on October 10, 1799, Gibson married Jonathan Jones and Phebe Griffing at the residence of the bride's father who lived twelve miles from Natchez. John G. Jones, *A Concise History of the Introduction of Protestantism into Mississippi and the Southwest* (St. Louis, 1886), 99-100.

⁴ B. M. Drake, "Tobias Gibson," *Methodist Review* (Nashville), II (1887), 240-41. For a general background for the years 1799-1804, see J. F. H. Claiborne, *Mississippi, As A Province, Territory and State* (Jackson, 1880), chaps. XXI-XXII; Robert Lowry and William H. McCordle, *A History of Mississippi* (Jackson, 1891), chaps. VII-VIII.

During the first months after his arrival, Gibson, suffering from tuberculosis,⁵ appeared to be benefited by the climate of this new location. He was able to establish some eight or ten societies on a circuit which required four weeks to cover. Gibson reported sixty members for his first year's work,⁶ and one hundred for the second. In the fall of the year 1801, the Natchez mission was transferred from the South Carolina Conference to the Western Conference. This mission was now one of the four circuits in the Cumberland District. The Cumberland together with the Holston and the Kentucky districts composed the Western Conference,⁷ which was bounded by the Gulf, the Appalachian Mountains, the Great Lakes, and the farthest outposts in the West.

In 1802 Gibson's health definitely began to fail. He was determined in spite of illness to make the five hundred-mile trip to the Western Conference which was appointed to assemble on October 2 at Strother's Meetinghouse in Sumner County, Tennessee.⁸ At the conference, after hearing Gibson's report of his work and observing his physical condition, Bishop Asbury decided that another missionary was needed in Mississippi and Louisiana. Moses Floyd, a young Georgian, volunteered to go and was accepted by the conference.⁹

Within a year the work of the Natchez Circuit became too arduous to be properly executed by Gibson, collapsed with consumption, and Floyd, sickened by the miasmal swamps. Additional recruits were needed in the territory, and Gibson presented his problem at the next Western Conference.¹⁰ In answer to his request, Hezekiah Harriman and Abraham Amos were delegated to the work and were instructed

⁵ J. B. McFerrin, *History of Methodism in Tennessee* (Nashville, 1871-1874), I, 198-99; Drake, "Tobias Gibson," *loc. cit.*, 238-39.

⁶ John G. Jones, *A Complete History of Methodism As Connected with the Mississippi Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South* (Nashville, 1908), I, 38.

⁷ *Minutes*, I, 103, 104, 111.

⁸ Drake, "Tobias Gibson," *loc. cit.*, 244-45.

⁹ Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, I, 71; *Minutes*, I, 111; Jones, *Protestantism in the Southwest*, 101.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 145-52. This conference met at Mt. Gerizim Church, near Cynthiana, Kentucky, in the autumn of 1803.

to accompany Gibson back to Natchez. In the first week of the following April, Tobias Gibson died at Natchez.¹¹

Traveling at this time in the Mississippi Territory was the eccentric Lorenzo Dow, a Methodist minister without any conference connections, who had come from New England to preach free-lance in this region. After a journey of four hundred miles from Georgia to the Tombigbee and the Tensaw settlements, Dow preached to the settlers there in May, 1803.¹² Continuing his journey westward, he and his three traveling companions reached the Natchez settlements. He presented letters of recommendation from officials in church and state, whereupon Moses Floyd invited Dow to speak to all of the important charges in the Natchez District.¹³

The Western Conference met for the second consecutive year at Cynthiana, Kentucky. At this time another call was made for volunteers to the Natchez country, and on the last day of the conference Learner Blackman offered to take up the work of Gibson. Nathan Barnes volunteered to become the colleague of Blackman.¹⁴

After much hard and dangerous travel, Blackman¹⁵ and Barnes arrived at St. Albans, Mississippi, on November 5. Here they visited with Moses Floyd and Barnes stayed to begin his first round on the only Methodist circuit then in the Mississippi Territory.¹⁶

Responsibility did not rest lightly on the shoulders of Learner Blackman who found much to discourage him in the Natchez District.¹⁷ Within a year many discouraging things happened. Tobias Gibson

¹¹ *Minutes*, I, 119, 125-26.

¹² Smith, *Methodism in Georgia and Florida*, 143-44; C. C. Sellers, *Lorenzo Dow: The Bearer of the Word* (New York, 1928), 68-69; Anson West, *A History of Methodism in Alabama* (Nashville, 1893), 27-28; B. F. Riley, *History of the Baptists in Alabama* (Birmingham, 1895), 15; Abel Stevens, *History of American Methodism* (New York, 1867), 426; Lorenzo Dow, *History of Cosmopolite: or the Writings of Rev. Lorenzo Dow* (Cincinnati, 1858), 164.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 164-68; C. B. Galloway, "Lorenzo Dow in Mississippi," *Mississippi Historical Society, Publications*, IV (1901), 236-37.

¹⁴ C. B. Galloway, "Rev. Learner Blackman," *Methodist Review*, XXV (1899), 864-68.

¹⁵ J. B. Finley, *Sketches of Western Methodism* (Cincinnati, 1857), 218, made the mistake of saying that Blackman traveled alone through the wilderness for fourteen days.

¹⁶ Dow, *History of Cosmopolite*, 216-17; Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, I, 117-19.

¹⁷ Finley, *Sketches*, 218-20.

had died a few months before Blackman reached the section. Moses Floyd in a "runaway match" had married a Miss Griffing against the wishes of her father. For this misconduct Floyd was suspended from the traveling ministry for a short period. Harriman had been dangerously ill and had to leave the district; and Amos was transferred to the Ohio District at the next conference.¹⁸

In the fall of 1805, Blackman made an eight hundred-mile journey to the Western Conference which convened at Griffith's in Scott County, Kentucky. Here Blackman laid before the assembled body the needs of the church in the Southwest. In order to enlarge the work properly, he urged that three circuits were needed. Bishop Asbury followed all of Blackman's recommendations and returned him in the capacity of presiding elder of the newest of the five districts of the Western Conference.¹⁹

For the mission just inaugurated at New Orleans, Asbury chose a volunteer, Elisha Bowman from Kentucky. The conference raised one hundred dollars for his outfit and expenses. Arriving in New Orleans in the midwinter of 1805-1806, he found himself friendless among twelve thousand people.²⁰ New Orleans was a revelation to Bowman. He had seen no place such as this—vice seemed to be engendered by every drainage canal. Gambling, a diversion for many and a livelihood for others, was widespread. The quadroon woman offered entertainment to men with money. Even the clergy was none too strict in its own moral discipline.²¹ Discouraged by many rebuffs, Bowman, too, soon left his task. He wrote: "I accordingly, on the 17th day of De-

¹⁸ Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, I, 91-92, 94-96, 98, 119; *Minutes*, I, 139. Also, see Galloway, "Rev. Learner Blackman," *loc. cit.*, 869.

¹⁹ Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, I, 130-34. For the appointments of the new preachers, see *Minutes*, I, 139.

²⁰ McTyeire, *History of Methodism*, 549-50; McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee*, II, 18-19. For a description of life in New Orleans at this time, see Alcée Fortier, *A History of Louisiana* (New York, 1904), II, chap. IX.

²¹ Albert Phelps, *Louisiana: A Record of Expansion* (New York, 1905), 207-14. Phelps used a diary of a Frenchman named Robin who was in New Orleans in 1803. This diary gives an interesting account of the social life of the city. For religious conditions in Louisiana, see James A. Robertson (ed.), *Louisiana Under the Rule of Spain, France, and the United States, 1785-1807* (Cleveland, 1911), I, 355-58; II, 283-84.

ember, 1805, shook off the dirt from my feet against this ungodly city of Orleans, and resolved to try the watery waste and pathless desert."²²

After a difficult trip by horseback and by canoe, Bowman reached the Opelousas country²³ where he found the social life as amazing as it had been in New Orleans. The evidences of deliberate comfort and leisure which he found in this Catholic settlement were almost too much for the rigor of Bowman's hand-to-mouth existence. He was shocked to find a racecourse laid off immediately in front of the church; and was genuinely confounded when informed that the priest swore, danced, and owned a race horse. Unable to tolerate such indulgences, Bowman set out forthwith from this place. Twenty miles farther he preached in a settlement of Americans, and he expected to find conditions better there. Each place seemed worse than the last, and Bowman, easily disheartened, kept pushing on westward.²⁴ Superficially he covered the whole of the Opelousas country, with the result that he secured within a year only seventeen members for the Methodist Church.²⁵

Not a single one of the seven preachers who served the Mississippi District during the years 1806 and 1807 was returned by the conference for the year 1808. Bishop Asbury chose a new delegation of six with Jacob Young as the presiding elder.²⁶ These new appointees immediately took up their charges.

After surveying and preaching in most of the settlements in and around Washington, the territorial capital, and the towns of Natchez, Gibsonport, and Selsertown, Young decided to cross the Mississippi and to travel in the territory west of the river. When he arrived at Natchez the river was so rough that he was forced to delay his crossing

²² This letter was first published in 1857 in the New Orleans *Christian Advocate* and later was reprinted in Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, I, 148-52.

²³ For another description of the Opelousas country, see J. T. Christian, *A History of the Baptists of Louisiana* (Shreveport, Louisiana, 1923), 50-53.

²⁴ McTyeire, *History of Methodism*, 551.

²⁵ *Minutes*, I, 147. The following year the Opelousas Circuit was served by Thomas Lasley. See his informative letter in A. H. Redford, *The History of Methodism in Kentucky* (Nashville, 1868-1870), II, 150-60.

²⁶ Examine the *Minutes*, I, 139, 148, 161.

a day and a half. During this stay Young saw much of lower Natchez and the flotsam of mankind that had drifted there.²⁷

Crossing the river he set out for Catahoula over a route which led through a forty-five mile swamp. After a two-day ride Young came to the home of a Captain Bowie; here, by an earlier agreement, Young met James Axley who had been assigned to the Opelousas Circuit. The Captain as described by Young was a "desperate sinner," but permitted the two preachers to hold a meeting in his house. When the meeting closed Axley guided Young through a wilderness of one hundred miles without a house to the Ouachita settlement. There they met Moses Floyd who formerly had been the assistant of Gibson in the Natchez mission. Floyd had given up the ministry and was now practicing medicine.²⁸ After exploring the country for four or five days Axley and Young rode back to Catahoula and from there Young returned alone to Natchez.²⁹

Remaining in Louisiana Axley had many trials to face. He was out of money; his clothes were ragged; and he had no church in which to preach. Through the generosity of Young and others he received some money for clothing, but instead of spending it in this way he bought floor boards for a church building he was erecting chiefly by his own labor. Upon its completion Axley preached an opening sermon and admitted eighteen to membership. Among the new converts was an old man who stole a piece of bacon the following day. Axley severely lectured him and crossed his name from the church roll.³⁰

Jacob Young was among the four preachers who were not returned

²⁷ Jacob Young, *Autobiography of a Pioneer* (Cincinnati, 1857), 218-23. See "Natchez in the Olden Times," for an interesting account written by George Willey, who at the time of writing had been an inhabitant of the town for eighty-three years. Claiborne, *Mississippi, As A Province, Territory and State*, 527-33.

²⁸ Young, *Autobiography*, 223-30. For a sketch of Floyd after his resignation from the ministry, see Jones, *Protestantism in the Southwest*, 147-49. Need for the services of physicians was so urgent that many preachers took up the practice of medicine. For an interesting combination of preacher and physician, see William M. Green, *Life and Papers of A. L. P. Green* (Nashville, 1887).

²⁹ Young, *Autobiography*, 230.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 293-34. See, also, Smith, *Methodism in Georgia and Florida*, 149. For an interesting story of how Axley obtained a night's lodging by singing, see Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, I, 445-47.

to the Mississippi District at the end of the conference year. The services of Jedidiah M'Minn and Anthony Houston were alone retained. Although this short tenure was contrary to the usual regulation, no explanation is at hand for this exchange of preachers who had served only one year. Perhaps they were not returned because of their failure to increase the membership in the district,³¹ and this failure in turn may be attributed to their poor training for the work.³²

While for ten years the Methodist Church had centered its attention on the river section of the Mississippi Territory, the Tombigbee country in the eastern part had been neglected as a missionary field. Except for the occasional sermons of Lorenzo Dow no minister of the Methodist faith had preached in Alabama until Matthew P. Sturdevant was sent there by the South Carolina Conference in December, 1807.³³ At this time the country known as Tombigbee stretched along the Tombigbee River for a distance of seventy or eighty miles, beginning near Tensaw Lake and the junction of the Alabama and Tombigbee rivers and extending to the north as far as Fort St. Stephens.³⁴

Sturdevant reached his new post in January, 1808. From then until the following December he did not see a preacher unless he happened to meet Gorham or Cochran, Baptist preachers who also went to Tombigbee in 1808. After a year of hard labor, Sturdevant reported to the South Carolina Conference that he had neither formed a society nor enrolled a single member. Most of the people of this region were described as Tories and criminals,³⁵ "a lawless and licentious crew."³⁶ Sturdevant was returned for a second year and Michael Burdge was also sent and given supervision of the work. By the end of the year a membership of seventy-one whites and fifteen blacks had been secured. In 1811 the Tombigbee country was transferred from the care of the

³¹ *Minutes*, I, 159, 161, 169, 171.

³² See Young, *Autobiography*, 217, for a description of the preachers who went with him to the Mississippi District.

³³ *Minutes*, I, 152, 161; McTyeire, *History of Methodism*, 523; Smith, *Methodism in Georgia and Florida*, 144-45.

³⁴ West, *Methodism in Alabama*, 29, 35-36, 38.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 38-41.

³⁶ Smith, *Methodism in Georgia and Florida*, 143. See A. J. Pickett, *History of Alabama and Incidentally of Georgia and Mississippi* (Birmingham, 1900), 464.

remote South Carolina Conference to the Mississippi District of the Western Conference,³⁷ to which district thirteen preachers and two missionaries were assigned.³⁸

Scarcely had these appointees reached their new posts when a series of earthquakes began to shake the Lower Mississippi Valley. Beginning on December 16, 1811, and continuing for three months nearly two thousand shocks occurred. It is not altogether certain that the phenomena were favorable to the growth of religion, but an inspection of the minutes of the Methodist Church will indicate clearly that earthquakes were highly productive of an increase in church membership.³⁹ The Mississippi District increased its membership from 789 to 1307 in one year's time. During the same year the single circuit of Wilkinson grew in membership from 71 to 241. The new members who joined the Methodist Church during the year of the quakes were equalled only by the number which came in for the next five years.⁴⁰

Until 1813 the work of the Methodist preachers in the Mississippi Valley had been at various times under the supervision of the South Carolina and the Tennessee conferences. To meet more adequately the needs of a rapidly growing territory the Mississippi Conference was formed. Its first session was held on November 1, at the home of Reverend Newet Vick, five miles southwest of Fayette in Jefferson County, Mississippi.⁴¹

The years 1814 and 1815 tested the mettle of Methodism in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. Only three hundred new members were added during the two-year period.⁴² The devastating influence of war took a heavy toll in this section.⁴³ The general religious zeal was

³⁷ *Minutes*, I, 172, 182, 184, 196, 212; Smith, *Methodism in Georgia and Florida*, 144-49.

³⁸ *Minutes*, I, 212; West, *Methodism in Alabama*, 55-56.

³⁹ See Walter B. Posey, "The Earthquake of 1811 and Its Influence on Evangelistic Methods in the Churches of the Old South," *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, Ser. II, Vol. I (1931), 107-14; Horace Jewell, *History of Methodism in Arkansas* (Little Rock, 1892), 26-27; McFerrin, *Methodism in Tennessee*, II, 263.

⁴⁰ *Minutes*, I, 209, 211, 227, 229, 330.

⁴¹ Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, I, 302; West, *Methodism in Alabama*, 60.

⁴² *Minutes*, I, 258, 295.

⁴³ See Francis Asbury, *Journal of Rev. Francis Asbury* (New York, 1852), III, 433-34.

supplanted by a martial spirit and a financial concern. A serious economic depression extended over the entire country. The rigorous blockade caused prices to reach unprecedented levels. Tea, coffee, molasses, and sugar were beyond the poor man's reach, while the staple products which he had for sale had little or no market.⁴⁴

Financial recovery, however, followed almost immediately the close of the war. The price of cotton reached thirty-four cents a pound in 1818,⁴⁵ and this brought money into regions little accustomed to this mode of exchange. Money meant luxuries, better clothing, more sightly and comfortable homes. This period marked the advent on inland waters of the steamboat, which aided the development of the routes of transportation and extended the migration to the Cotton Belt⁴⁶ as though to a promised land. It was in these years that King Cotton began his lengthy reign.

Few things have transformed Southern life more than the upland cotton plant; its culture spread over the Appalachians and down into the South and Southwest, where the abundance of fertile and cheap lands lured the planters within the period of one generation from Georgia to Texas.⁴⁷ This rush to the cotton belt caused a most extraordinary movement from the states of Kentucky, Virginia, and the Carolinas. Penniless immigrants became farmers; and some of these same farmers, with the development of cotton, became planters possessing thousands of acres and hundreds of slaves.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ John B. McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1885-1892), IV, 217-18; Edward Channing, *A History of the United States* (New York, 1907-1932), IV, 538-39.

⁴⁵ A. B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition* (New York, 1906), 60.

⁴⁶ See U. B. Phillips, *A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt to 1860* (New York, 1908), *passim*; McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*, IV, chap. XXXIII; J. T. Adams, *The Epic of America* (New York, 1931), 151-53.

⁴⁷ H. C. White, "The Expansion of the Area of Cultivation, 1783-1865," *The South in the Building of the Nation* (Richmond, 1913), V, 40-42. See also, W. L. Fleming, "The Slave Labor-System in the Ante-Bellum South," *ibid.*, V, 108-18; W. G. Brown, *The Lower South in American History* (New York, 1903), 24-25; C. W. Ramsdell, "The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XVI (1929-1930), 153. See table in Channing, *History of the United States*, V, 433, for the cotton crop of the several states from 1791-1834.

⁴⁸ For this metamorphosis see W. E. Dodd, "The Plantation Farm System in Southern Agriculture," *The South in the Building of the Nation*, V, 73-78. For the change in South

Against this background of speculation and the inordinate desire to make quick fortunes, the evangelical preachers of the Methodist and Baptist faiths worked in the Lower South. These denominations which had so successfully appealed to the poorer classes and converted them through preachers possessing sin-lashing tongues made little appeal to the planter class. The landed gentry preferred the formal type of preacher, who conducted a more ritualistic ceremony and a religion which promised to grow more select and autocratic as the wealth of its members increased.⁴⁹ And, furthermore, the planter did not care for the rigid rules which the Methodist Church had passed against slaveholding. The profits which came from cotton were sufficient to deaden any strong sentiment favoring the emancipation of slaves.⁵⁰ This fact the Methodist preachers in the Lower Mississippi Valley recognized, and they cautiously took a very discreet attitude toward slaveholding.⁵¹ Not a reference to slavery in any form can be found in the *Journal of the Mississippi Conference*.⁵²

Throughout the whole South great concern arose when the General Conference in session in 1820 appointed a committee to study the slavery question. A speech or motion on the dreaded subject was made on almost every day of the twenty-seven that the conference sat.⁵³ Before the session adjourned, the General Conference resumed control of all rulings on slavery and withdrew from the several annual confer-

Carolina, see W. A. Schaper, "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina," *American Historical Association, Annual Report*, 1900, I, 245-52. See, also, T. P. Abernethy, "Andrew Jackson and the Rise of Southwestern Democracy," *American Historical Review*, XXXIII (1927-1928), 64-77.

⁴⁹ W. E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom* (New Haven, 1921), 101-102; T. P. Abernethy, "Social Relations and Political Control in the Old Southwest," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XVI (1929-1930), 533-35; Henry E. Chambers, *Mississippi Valley Beginnings* (New York, 1922), 274.

⁵⁰ Channing, *History of the United States*, V, 140; L. C. Matlack, *Antislavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York, 1881), 72.

⁵¹ Walter B. Posey, "Influence of Slavery Upon the Methodist Church in the Early South and Southwest," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XVII (1930-1931), 539-40.

⁵² Jones, *Methodism in Mississippi*, II, 240.

⁵³ See *Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1796-1836* (New York, 1855), I, 175-240, for the conference of 1820. For a bitter speech, see C. B. Galloway, "Thomas Griffin: A Boanerges of the Early Southwest," *Mississippi Historical Society, Publications*, VII (1903), 163-64.

ences any power to regulate slave traffic among church members.⁵⁴ With the passage of this regulation much antagonism within the annual conferences was necessarily reduced. When no rules could be passed there was little reason for bitter discussions and wrangles.

The work of the Methodist Church progressed in the state of Alabama without any serious hindrances. By the time the Alabama Territory was admitted to statehood three different conferences were contributing to the work in this region. The Mississippi Conference had one appointment, the Tombigbee; the South Carolina Conference had sent Alexander Talley as "missionary to Alabama Territory"; and the Tennessee Conference had erected a district to serve its neighboring commonwealth.⁵⁵

North Alabama during the late twenties reproduced with pristine enthusiasm the camp meetings which two decades earlier had swept Kentucky. A series at Florence, Decatur, Courtland, and Tuscumbia gave William McMahon cause to write in 1828 that these towns "are all in a flame."⁵⁶ Methodism was initiated into the locale of the present-day Birmingham in 1817 when David Owen moved from Tennessee.⁵⁷ Montgomery in 1828 was a town of twelve hundred inhabitants with no meetinghouse and no regular preaching appointment.⁵⁸ Probably the first minister to preach in Montgomery was James King, a preacher of the Methodist Church. During a part of 1819 he preached on alternate Sundays at Alabama Town and Montgomery.⁵⁹ The first appointment to Mobile was made by the Mississippi Conference in 1821. The

⁵⁴ *Journals of the General Conference*, I, 205, 207, 226, 228, 229; Robert Paine, *Life and Times of William M'Kendree* (Nashville, 1869), I, 396.

⁵⁵ *Minutes*, I, 332, 333, 343, 344; West, *Methodism in Alabama*, 128-29; Thomas M. Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography* (Chicago, 1921), II, 979.

⁵⁶ *Christian Advocate* (New York), December 26, 1828. For these and other camp meetings in Alabama, see issues of December 9, 1826; April 28, November 9, December 14, 1827; February 22, November 21, 28, December 5, 1828.

⁵⁷ West, *Methodism in Alabama*, 120-21, 126; *Minutes*, I, 328, 332.

⁵⁸ For scarcity of Bibles in Montgomery, see *Christian Advocate* (New York), September 12, 1828.

⁵⁹ West, *Methodism in Alabama*, 347-53; Owen, *History of Alabama*, II, 1038.

mission was discontinued the following year, but was re-established in 1824.⁶⁰

Methodism advanced throughout the inland sections of Mississippi with pleasing rapidity, but the river towns stubbornly continued to resist the evangelical efforts. The river front of Natchez retained its notorious features, and it was with courage that Thomas Griffin preached there in 1813.⁶¹ John J. Audubon, visiting Natchez in 1820, found it a town of three thousand people with unsatisfactory churches.⁶² Two years later conditions were unimproved. John A. Quitman wrote that gambling and intemperance were carried to great excess, Sunday was a day of debauchery, and the law had little jurisdiction over the town.⁶³ Timothy Flint, making a trip down the Mississippi River in 1822, commented on the general irreligious conditions. He noted that Warrentown was a settlement of one hundred residences, no church, and one professor of religion—a woman who said that she was a Methodist.⁶⁴ The church in the state as a whole, nevertheless, enjoyed within ten years, 1822-1832, the tremendous growth of doubled membership.⁶⁵

Success, on the other hand, did not attend the missionary endeavors in Louisiana and its chief city New Orleans.⁶⁶ The problem of awakening spiritually the people of New Orleans⁶⁷ to the call of Methodism

⁶⁰ *Minutes*, I, 387, 406, 412, 458. Notice the growth by 1832. *Christian Advocate* (New York), February 15, 1828; *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years 1829-1839* (New York, 1840), II, 185; West, *Methodism in Alabama*, 263.

⁶¹ Galloway, "Thomas Griffin: A Boanerges of the Early Southwest," *loc. cit.*, 159-60. Griffin was on the Ouachita Circuit in 1812 and for his work received \$9.50.

⁶² J. J. Audubon, *Delineations of American Scenery and Character* (New York, 1926), 332-33.

⁶³ J. F. H. Claiborne, *Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman* (New York, 1860), I, 71-72.

⁶⁴ J. E. Kirkpatrick, *Timothy Flint—Pioneer, Missionary, Author, Editor, 1780-1840* (Cincinnati, 1911), 152-60.

⁶⁵ *Minutes*, I, 409; II, 159, 213.

⁶⁶ Adam Hodgson, an English divine, observing New Orleans in the spring of 1815, noted that "there was not a Bible to be found, either to be sold, or gratuitously distributed; and the only Protestant place of worship was in an upper room belonging to an individual." Adam Hodgson, *Letters from North America Written During a Tour in the United States and Canada* (London, 1824), II, 232.

⁶⁷ For an interesting account of New Orleans by Harriet Martineau who visited the city in 1835, see her *Retrospect of Western Travel* (New York, 1838), I, 256-62. A

continued unsolved for some time. Benjamin Drake stationed in the city in 1825 and 1826 wrote: "To this day New Orleans presents more unyielding resistance to the evangelical gospel . . . than any other city in the South."⁶⁸ The entire state of Louisiana was a puzzling riddle. Many sections remained as spiritually barren as in the days when Bowman made his fruitless efforts to establish Methodism.⁶⁹ Seventeen years after he had entered the Louisiana work only ninety-nine white and ninety colored members had been added to the church roll.⁷⁰

By 1830 the Mississippi Valley was astir with business, and speculation grew rife. In this fertile country many fortunes were made in three or four years;⁷¹ some planters were known to have made more than fifty thousand dollars in clear profit from a single cotton crop.⁷² With the increase of wealth, financial contributions to the church became much larger. For some years the church had already directed its activities into fields other than evangelistic.⁷³

In 1832 the General Conference divided the Mississippi Conference into the Alabama and the Mississippi. Within the territory covered by the Mississippi and the newly formed Alabama Conference there were 8 districts, 62 circuits and missions, 104 preachers, and 20,692 members—one-fourth of whom were colored.⁷⁴ This remarkable extension of the activities of the Methodist Church in the Lower Southwest in a period of thirty-three years came from the foresight of its leaders, the heroic devotion of the circuit rider, and the adaptability of the creed to the

description of a Sunday in New Orleans in this period may be found in *Christian, Baptists of Louisiana*, 59.

⁶⁸ W. W. Drake, "A Sketch of Rev. Benjamin M. Drake, D. D.," *Methodist Review*, XLIV (1918), 77.

⁶⁹ *Methodist Magazine* (New York), III (1820), 151-53.

⁷⁰ *Minutes*, I, 406.

⁷¹ Lyle Saxon, *Old Louisiana* (New York, 1929), 132-37; C. B. Galloway, "The Rev. Elijah Steele—An Apostle of the Early South-West," *Methodist Review*, III (1881), 31.

⁷² Claiborne, *Life of Quitman*, I, 72.

⁷³ C. B. Galloway, "Elizabeth Female Academy—The Mother of Female Colleges," Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications*, II (1899), 169-78; Walter B. Posey, "La Grange: Alabama's Earliest College," Birmingham-Southern College, *Bulletin* XXVI (1933), no. 6; West, *Methodism in Alabama*, chaps. XVIII, XXIX; W. G. Clark, *History of Education in Alabama, 1702-1889* (Washington, 1889), 164-71.

⁷⁴ *Minutes*, II, 183-85, 213. The territory north of the Tennessee River was in the Tennessee Conference.

needs of the people. It has been charged that the unlearned Methodist preacher was not held in high esteem by the more enlightened people,⁷⁵ and perhaps he was not, but his influence was beyond measure and the results which he achieved among the various classes were significant. Within a third of a century he added to the Methodist Church twenty thousand converts from a section generally considered difficult to influence.

⁷⁵ L. R. J. Halsey (ed.), *The Works of Philip Lindsley, D. D.* (Philadelphia, 1866), I, 443-44. See, also, Dodd, *Cotton Kingdom*, 102-103.

Legal System of the Confederate States

By WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

The legal affairs of the Confederate States are largely an unknown story.¹ The operations of the Confederate Army have ever been a popular and well-understood theme. To a lesser extent the diplomatic and naval affairs have engaged the attention of students. The treatment of the president and the Congress has been more or less incidental. The treasury and post-office departments have each had a book or so devoted to their short careers. But the department of justice and the judiciary have not emerged from obscurity. There is a reason for this obscurity, and this reason may be of sufficient interest to warrant a brief discussion of it.

During the progress of the war, the government at Washington essayed to treat the government at Richmond as merely a military junta. Whenever it was necessary to take into account the high civil authorities, President Lincoln cautiously referred to them as persons of high influence in the states in rebellion. He was ever fearful, lest by the slightest implication, he should recognize the existence, *de facto* or *de jure*, of the government of the Confederate States. By this pretense he deceived no one. That there was a national government at Richmond, holding forth in all the power and majesty of supreme law, based upon the consent of the governed, was nowhere doubted. Fully organized in the three branches characteristic of the American system, this government made its strong arm felt by sword and precept from the Potomac to beyond the Pecos, and sent its men-of-war into the utmost seas. But,

¹ This paper was read before the American Historical Association at its annual meeting in Chattanooga, Tennessee, December 30, 1935. The author has in progress a judicial history of the Confederate States.

at last, by weight of numbers, the government and people of the South were crushed. The official fictions then took on more convincing appearance of fact. There was none to dispute the wartime pretensions of the Lincoln Administration.

The Supreme Court of the United States, when presented with cases growing out of happenings and transactions in the South during the Great Tragedy, attempted to meet the issues without admitting the existence of even a *de facto* government of the Confederate States. To maintain this position, the Court reduced itself to the sad plight of hopping first on one foot and then the other. The *dicta* in one case would prove a boomerang in another. Nevertheless, by din of constant hammering and ingenious calling of white black and black white, the Court enforced the doctrine that the Confederate States government "was simply the military representative of the insurrection against the authority of the United States; when its military forces were overthrown, it utterly perished, and with it all its enactments."² Thus from the official point of view there was nothing to write about save the military events. As the conquerors usually write the histories, historians largely took their cues accordingly. To be sure, some wrote from the Southern point of view but until very recent years, they were soldiers telling of their campaigns, sailors of their cruises, a clerk giving an inside glimpse of the war department, a president justifying secession and the military conduct of the war, a vice-president discoursing on constitutional aspects, a postmaster general sketching briefly his department of government, a member of the Provisional and First congresses writing a *Civil History* without a mention of the judiciary.

No one of the judges of the Confederate States or of the high state courts contributed a memoir to the history of the third branch of government—they were probably too busy re-establishing a law practice. One turns in vain to the *in memoriams* or obituaries in the court reports for enlightenment on the careers of Confederate jurists. One is amazed to find an almost general skipping or suppression of their judicial services under the Confederacy. Were their surviving brothers of the

² *Williams v. Bruffys*, 96 U. S. 176 (1877).

law browbeaten by Reconstruction? Partly, perhaps, but certainly not wholly. Was it because the United States Supreme Court in *Hickman v. Jones*, December term, 1869,⁸ declared that the Confederate judiciary had been from its beginning a "nullity, and could exercise no rightful jurisdiction"; that the "forms of law with which it clothed its proceedings gave no protection to those who, assuming to be its officers, were the instruments by which it acted"; and that the judges, attorneys, marshals, and jurors who composed the Confederate courts were individually liable to defendants for trespass?

Certain it is that the conquerors so effectually set aside the decisions of the Confederate judiciary that a general sense of futility prevailed. The memory of judicial affairs faded so completely that, ten years ago, an eminent professor and writer of American history, himself a Southerner, expressed surprise when told of the existence of the district courts of the Confederate States. More recently a North Carolina jurist, the author of several biographies of actors in the Great Tragedy, told the writer that it was his understanding that the Confederate courts were organized at the beginning of the war; and, after the trial of a few prize cases, played out. In the face of this neglect, extended research in the judicial field of the Confederate States has been a grand adventure with excitement and thrill of discovery.

The fate of captured property is precarious. Some of the records of the Confederate courts were sent to the war department, and a part of these found permanent lodging in the office of the adjutant general. Some were sent to the office of the attorney general and have never been heard of since. There are a few of the records in the Library of Congress. Private collectors and libraries have garnered a few more. The bulk of the extant records are hidden away in the file rooms of the United States courts re-established upon the ruins of the Confederate courts. Long forgotten records have been found from the attic of the Senate wing of the national Capitol, to the attic of the post office in Tallahassee; from the file rooms of the Eastern District of Virginia to the record room of the Eastern District of Louisiana. From Georgia

⁸ 9 Wallace 197 (1870).

to New Mexico original records of Federal,⁴ state, and territorial courts have come to light. The manuscript record of the opinions of the attorney general resides in the New York Public Library. The decisions of the state supreme courts may generally be found in the state reports; but the decisions of the Confederate States courts were not published save for occasional cases in pamphlet form. Reading, abstracting, and collating these evidences of justice in the war-torn Confederacy has been a fascinating avocation and instructive of the greatness and glory that might have been the Confederate States of America.

The judiciary of the United States began its dissolution in the South the moment that it was known that Lincoln had been chosen president in the election of Tuesday, November 6, 1860. The first definite step looking to the secession of South Carolina occurred the next day in Charleston, and is briefly told on a small tablet placed at the entrance to Number 23 Chalmers Street. This little painted wooden marker tells us:

FORMER
U. S. COURT HOUSE
HERE ON NOV. 7
1860
JUDGE A. G. MAGRATH
LEFT THE BENCH
DIVESTED HIMSELF
OF HIS OFFICIAL
ROBES AND DECLARED
THAT THE TEMPLE
OF JUSTICE IS
NOW CLOSED

Stark tragedy pervaded that courtroom and the sense of it affected every spectator. Judge Magrath's dramatic divestiture produced a profound effect not only in Charleston and South Carolina but throughout the entire United States. The separatist movement gained momentum

⁴ The adjective "Federal," as used in this paper, relates to the Confederate States unless qualified by "late" or expressly connected with the United States government. It may be pointed out that the Confederate States, according to the Permanent Constitution, was a "federal government"; whereas, the word "federal" is not used in the United States Constitution at all.

rapidly, and President Buchanan felt the whole fabric of Federal authority dissolving under him with no power to restore it.

The convention of South Carolina vested the powers of the late Federal component of government in the state establishment. The state Circuit Court for the District of Charleston succeeded to the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, and the Court of Appeals to the jurisdiction lately exercised by the United States Supreme Court. The other seceded states generally followed suit and conferred the late Federal judicial powers upon existing state courts. Georgia created two new state courts known as the Northern and Southern District Courts of the Independent State of Georgia. But independent nationality was not long for the several cotton states; and on February 8, 1861, the Provisional Constitution provided for a new Federal judiciary. First the legislative then the executive branches of government blossomed into being. On the thirty-sixth day after the adoption of the Constitution, a Judiciary Act was approved and a Federal bench nominated and confirmed. Scarcely a step was lost in the march of justice. When Judge Magrath, after a brief but colorful career as premier in the National government of South Carolina, resumed his robes as the judge of the Confederate States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at the opening of the new court, he said: "It would have been a far more pleasant duty to have opened the Temple of Justice with Peace exercising its influence upon the relations [of] men who speak the same language and [who were] for years united in the bonds of a common political union. . . . But if those relations are distracted, and the horrors of strife are substituted for the blessings of repose, it is because evil passions have induced those who are now at war with the Confederate States, to seek their subjection; and in that the ruin of those . . . within their limits."⁵

But between that spring day in 1861 and the day of subjection four years later, the Confederate courts were destined to many days of sitting, to decide countless disputes, to sequester millions of dollars of property belonging to alien enemies, to imprison and to hang malefactors, to grant relief to some conscripts, to remand others to the mili-

⁵ Charleston *Mercury* (tri-weekly edition), May 25, 1861.

tary service, to uphold some laws and to deny the constitutionality of others, to condemn prizes and to allow salvage, to hear and adjudge the entire range of causes at common law, in equity and in admiralty.

Within the thirteen Confederate states, there had been eighteen United States judges. All but five of these resigned to follow the Confederate fortunes.⁶ Only half of those who resigned were reappointed by President Davis. Some entered the army, others served in the Provisional Congress and elsewhere. The entire body of court functionaries in all of the states, except in Kentucky⁷ and Missouri, went Confederate. Thus when Lincoln issued his famous proclamation of April 15, 1861, there was not a single United States marshal within the Confederate States. He was, therefore, boldly facetious when he declared that the combinations, which had been obstructing the execution of law from South Carolina to Texas, were "too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings or by the powers, vested in the marshals by law."⁸

The United States court was quickly re-established in the western counties of Virginia and in Kentucky. In 1862 courts were wedged in at Nashville, St. Augustine, and New Orleans, and in 1864 at Alexandria, Virginia. Attempts were made to reopen United States court at Huntsville, Alabama, and Little Rock, Arkansas. The writs of the re-established courts only ran as far as there were blue bayonets to enforce them. The Confederates made no attempt to set up Federal courts in the divided states of Missouri and Kentucky. There were in these, however, some local courts which adhered to the Confederate side. But elsewhere the Confederate States district courts were securely seated.

To be sure, the fortunes of war occasionally drove a court from its

⁶ The two Federal judges in Texas did not resign when the state seceded but made no attempt to hold United States court until after the war, when they resumed their judicial functions. The two judges in Missouri and the one in the Southern District of Florida continued to hold court under the aegis of United States arms.

⁷ Judge Thomas B. Monroe, District of Kentucky, resigned and was elected to the Provisional Congress.

⁸ James D. Richardson (comp.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Bureau of National Literature, 1912), 3214.

accustomed seat; but under liberal legislation, the judge altered the time and place of sitting to meet the emergency.⁹ However, in a surprisingly large number of the districts, the court sat regularly at its usual seat until the virtual end of the government.¹⁰

Naturally the question may arise as to the extent of the judicial power confided to the Federal courts of the Confederacy. The third or judiciary article of the Provisional and the Permanent constitutions of the Confederate States and of the Constitution of the United States vary from each other in certain significant respects. All three agree that the jurisdiction of the Federal courts shall extend to (1) all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; (2) all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; (3) controversies to which the Federal government shall be a party; (4) controversies between two or more states; and (5) between citizens claiming land under grants of different states.

The Provisional and the United States constitutions allowed Federal jurisdiction to extend to controversies "between citizens of different States." This salutary provision was contained in the Permanent Constitution as submitted by the drafting committee of the Montgomery Convention. It was stricken therefrom on the votes of South Carolina, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. The Georgia and Alabama delegations voted to retain it. It should be recalled that the border states had not then joined. However, the convention added from the

⁹ E.g., jury terms for the Northern Division of the District of Mississippi were held at Pontotoc in August, 1861, and February, 1862; but at Holly Springs in April and October, 1862 and 1863, and April, 1864; and at Columbus in October, 1864, and April, 1865. During the last term, as the Confederacy was tottering, orders were issued for the attendance of grand and petit juries at the next term to be held on October 2, 1865.

¹⁰ For instance, the court for the Eastern District of Virginia adjourned on Thursday, March 30, 1865, to Monday, April 3, at 11 A.M., but the enemy entered Richmond just two hours before time set for the reopening. In Mobile, court was held for the last time in the Southern Division of the District of Alabama on April 6, 1865. The city was evacuated on April 11 and was occupied by the enemy on the following day. It may be interesting to note that the last case before the Richmond court was the conscript case of *Mortimer D. Williams v. Captain W. H. Fry* on a petition praying for a writ of habeas corpus; and at Mobile, the salvage case of *Michael L. Martin v. Six Bales of Derelict Cotton*. To readers of present-day comic strips, it may be amusing to know that a sequestration case was encountered in the District of Florida entitled *The Confederate States of America v. A. Gump and Son*.

United States pattern two clauses which had been omitted from the Provisional Constitution, namely, all cases "between a State and citizens of another State, where the State is plaintiff; . . . and between a State or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects; but no State shall be sued by a citizen or subject of any foreign state."¹¹

The remaining judiciary clause is different in all three constitutions. In the Provisional Constitution it reads: "The judicial power shall extend to all cases of law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and of this Confederacy, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under its authority." The intention was thereby to permit the Confederate courts to take up and carry to a conclusion all causes originating prior to secession. Under this authority the Confederate States District Court for Georgia tried, convicted, and sentenced to five years imprisonment a man indicted at the last term of the United States court. His offense was in connection with the slave trade. Numerous other instances might be cited.

The phrase, "The laws of the United States," was not repeated in the Permanent Constitution. Perhaps it was thought by its framers that, as the first act of the Provisional Congress had already embodied in the Confederate law all United States statutes consistent with the Confederate organic law, this phrase was no longer necessary. At any rate the judges saw no difficulty in continuing jurisdiction in such cases. However, the attorney general was differently minded and in December, 1862, held that offenses against the United States prior to secession were not offenses against the Confederate States; that the Confederate States was not the successor of the United States; that the ordinances of secession repealed the laws of the United States; that an act of Congress making an offense against the United States prior to secession, an offense against the Confederate States was an *ex post facto* law. In consequence he directed the district attorneys not to prosecute such cases. This did not mean that the attorney general's office, any more than the courts, repudiated the principle *stare decisis*. His opinions

¹¹ Art. III, sec. 2, cl. 1.

and the decisions of the courts were frequently based on the prewar opinions and decisions of United States authorities.

There is one more point to be made in reference to the jurisdiction of the Confederate courts. The Permanent Constitution struck from the clause last quoted the phrase, "of law and equity." This withdrawal of the constitutional distinction between the law and equity sides of the Federal Court did not operate to abolish the distinction, but left to the regulation of Congress the enforcement of legal rights and the pursuit of equitable remedies. This omission was in the interest of state rights since it made it possible to correlate the operation of the Federal courts to that of the state courts in Louisiana and Texas where the Roman conception of a single jurisdiction prevailed.

Let us consider now the organization of the Confederate judiciary. The Confederate fathers abolished the circuit courts and vested their jurisdiction in the district courts. At first, some of the Confederate judges did not understand the full significance of this move, and held separate sessions of their courts to handle business of old circuit court character. Thus Judge William G. Jones opened his court at Mobile in April, 1861, on the time appointed for the old United States Circuit Court and disposed of the inherited docket. One of these cases was an admiralty appeal from a decision that he himself had made in 1859 while sitting as judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama. Congress remedied such travesty on appellate justice by amending the law to make cases under similar circumstances appealable direct to the Supreme Court.

In approaching the Supreme Court of the Confederate States we come to an interesting subject. Under the Provisional Constitution, this court was to be composed of all of the district judges sitting annually at the seat of government. Before the time for the first session, however, the Provisional Congress repealed the phrase fixing the time of sitting, thereby rendering the court inoperative. The Permanent Constitution, which went into operation on February 18, 1862, did not limit or prescribe the composition of the Supreme Court, and at the first session of the Permanent Congress, President Davis called the

attention of that body to its immediate duty of organizing the Supreme Court under the provisions of the Permanent Constitution. On April 10, 1862, William Porcher Miles of South Carolina introduced an organization bill in the House. From that time on until the end of the government there was some legislation before one or both houses of Congress to establish the Supreme Court; but the two houses could never agree on the same bill. Apparently, it was not so much a matter of principle as of personal politics. As an example of this, recall the disgraceful outbreak between the fiery Yancey of Alabama and the conservative Ben Hill of Georgia, which occurred during the Senate debates in the winter of 1863.¹² When the final adjournment occurred in March, 1865, the lower chamber left on its table House Bill 239 to provide for the appointment of one chief justice and four associate justices, at annual salaries of \$8000 and \$7000, respectively. Under this bill, the Supreme Court was to hold two annual sessions at Richmond on the first Mondays in January and June, with special terms at the call of the chief justice. The court was expressly authorized to hear appeals in prewar cases. Thereby the doctrine of continuity of justice was to be reaffirmed by Congress.

The fate of the Supreme Court in Congress was shared by another court the establishment of which was mandatory under the Constitution. This was the Court of Claims. In the United States this court had been lately established under the general powers of Congress to create inferior tribunals; but the Permanent Constitution of the Confederate States provided that Congress should appropriate no money, "except by a vote of two-thirds of both Houses," "*for the payment of claims against the Confederate States*" except those "*the justice of which shall have been judicially declared by a TRIBUNAL FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT, which it is hereby made the duty of Congress to establish.*"¹³ Despite this plain

¹² The allusion here is to the fight which took place on the floor of the Senate, February 4, 1863, between Yancey, who fiercely opposed the establishment of the Supreme Court, and Hill, who ardently favored the set up of the Court with all of its traditional authority.

¹³ Art. I, sec. 9, cl. 9. The italics and small capitals are the author's.

mandate, Congress quibbled over details of organization and wound up its life without bringing the court into being. Meanwhile, the country was not entirely without machinery for adjudicating claims. The Board of Sequestration Commissioners was authorized to hear and adjudge claims of Confederate citizens growing out of hostile operations.¹⁴ The executive departments were also authorized to pass on certain classes of claims.¹⁵

A word more about the Federal court system. There was the Court of Admiralty and Maritime Jurisdiction at Key West.¹⁶ There were the territorial courts in Arizona. These consisted of probate courts in each county, three district courts of general jurisdiction, and a territorial supreme court, whose decisions were reviewable by the Federal Supreme Court at Richmond. The probate and district courts functioned during the year of Confederate occupation. Then there were the two extra-territorial courts in the Indian protectorate. They were organized on the lines of the district courts in the states, except that the judge was appointed for a term of four years rather than during good behavior. The District of Tush-ca-hom-ma embraced the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations and the Indian Reserve lying west of the Chickasaw country. The District of Cha-lah-ki included the Creek, Seminole, Cherokee, Osage, Quapaw, Seneca, and Shawnee lands. The judge and the district attorneys were Confederate citizens but the ministerial personnel consisted of citizens of the Indian nations. Though the Indian courts were authorized under the treaties made in the summer and fall of 1861, and the enabling legislation was promptly approved, Congress refused to confirm the nominations when first made in 1862; and the courts were not actually established until 1865, near the end of the war.

¹⁴ Act of August 30, 1861, chap. LXI, sec. 14.

¹⁵ E.g., Act of August 30, 1861, chap. LVIII.

¹⁶ The establishing Act of March 11, 1861, chap. XXXIX, authorized the holding of court at other points in Southern Florida than the place named in the title of the court. McQueen McIntosh, formerly judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida, was appointed judge of this court, and was in Key West, May 12-14, 1861, for the purpose of organizing and holding court. Though Key West remained in hostile possession throughout the war, Judge McIntosh was in occasional exercise of judicial functions, and drew his pay quarterly from the attorney general's office until the end of the government.

The dilatoriness of Congress in judicial matters was a constant source of annoyance to the attorney general, who frequently took time out from his multitudinous duties to prod Congress. This was true all along the line of the law ministers in the Davis cabinet.

Let us look in for a moment on the department of justice, the first American executive department of that name. In the United States scheme of things at that time, the attorney general presided over simply an office, as the department of justice at Washington was created after the war. In establishing their government, the Confederates omitted a department of the interior, which savored too much of Federal paternalism, but gave some interior duties to the new department of justice. The organization of the department consisted of the office of the attorney general¹⁷ with one assistant attorney general;¹⁸ the patent office under the commissioner of patents;¹⁹ the bureau of public printing under the superintendent;²⁰ and the law office under the law clerk.²¹ The duties²² of the office of attorney general were to organize the courts of justice; represent the government before the Supreme Court and the Board of Sequestration Commissioners; give advice to the president and heads of departments; advise upon and record pardons; supervise the accounts of court officers; supervise all claims against the government; receive and file claims for money against the Confederate States for which no mode of payment was provided by existing law; and organize the territories. The law office had custody of the laws, prepared the indexes and marginal notes, and supervised their publication and distribution. The patent office, like the post office, was required by law to be self-supporting—and it was.²³

The attorney general's office gave in all 213 recorded opinions from April 1, 1861, to March 24, 1865, inclusive. The first opinion discussed the tariff laws and found that lemons and oranges were on the free list

¹⁷ Act of February 21, 1861, chap. XII.

¹⁸ Act of March 7, 1861, chap. XXX, sec. 1.

¹⁹ Act of May 21, 1861, chap. LXVI.

²⁰ Act of February 27, 1861, chap. XVIII, sec. 13.

²¹ Act of August 5, 1861, chap. XIV, sec. 7.

²² *First Annual Report of the Attorney General* (Richmond), February 26, 1862.

²³ *Fourth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Patents* (Richmond), January, 1865.

but that walnuts were dutiable. The last opinion interpreted the expression "foreign exchange" as used in an act of March 17, 1865. The last written but unrecorded opinion was given by the attorney general to the president on the constitutional aspect of the impending surrender.

No discussion of the Federal legal system of the Confederate States would be complete without some mention of the military administration of justice. The system of courts-martial in the army and navy came over with only slight changes from the United States service. But, in 1862, General Lee found that the inconveniences of the old courts-martial system were insufferable. It worked for delays, took officers from their commands at critical times, and provided at best only amateur judges. He recommended the institution of a series of permanent military courts to be composed of three high ranking officers chosen for eminent judicial attainments. Congress quickly provided the necessary legislation and a court was appointed for each army corps and geographical department.²⁴ Later, one was provided for each cavalry division and for the headquarters of reserves in each state. The judges were given the rank of colonel of cavalry. A truly high grade bench was chosen, containing men who had occupied important places in the judicial and executive branches of the state and Federal governments, among them LeRoy P. Walker, the first Confederate secretary of war, and D. F. Jamison, the president of the South Carolina secession convention. The judge advocate and the marshal of these courts had the rank of captain of cavalry. These courts were authorized, in occupied hostile areas, to try civil offenders. This system of military judicature worked very satisfactorily but it was not copied by the United States Army during or since the war.

Let us turn briefly to the state courts. Secession brought no changes in them, save for the temporary increase in jurisdiction during the interregnum between the two Federal judiciaries. When the end of the war came, the state courts perished in some states, as in Texas, but continued in others, as in Georgia. Those state supreme courts which survived, stoutly upheld the validity of Confederate acts and decisions.

²⁴ Act of October 9, 1862, chap. XXXVI.

A case in point is that of *Freeman v. Bass* begun in the United States District Court at Savannah in January, 1860, and completed two years later in the homologous Confederate court. Out of this case, litigation arose in the state courts in May, 1866, reaching the Supreme Court of Georgia at the June term, 1866. This court agreed with the lower tribunal that "the Confederate Court had jurisdiction of the case, the subject matter, and the parties, embraced in the exemplified record, and that any defence pleaded and passed upon, in that case, by the Court or jury, was conclusive on the defendant, Bass, and such matter so passed upon, could not again be set up as a defence in the case at bar."²⁵

In the case of *Martin and Johnson v. Blood*, decided at the December term, 1866, the Supreme Court of Georgia again recognized the Confederate States District Court as a lawful tribunal, whose judgments were binding notwithstanding the unfortunate outcome of the war.²⁶ The effect of these decisions was that Georgia had legally seceded; joined a new federal union, which it had voluntarily abandoned by the action of the State Convention of October 25, 1865; and had now rejoined the original federation, namely, the United States. But this doctrine was not satisfactory to the Reconstruction authorities, and after the December term, 1866, the old judges were one by one worked off the bench, and new judges willing to speak the will of the conquerors were installed. Thus by 1868, the court had repudiated its early pro-Confederate decisions, and was holding that the state had never been out of the Union of the United States, though the power of the state had been for a time perverted, and that the decisions of the so-called Confederate States courts now gave no protection to those who had litigated therein. But this was not the end. The Supreme Court of Georgia, under the chief justiceship of Joseph E. Brown, in 1869, admitted that the South was conquered territory, subject to the unrestrained will of the conquerors; that Congress had the right to dictate what kind of state constitution the people could adopt; and that Congress had the right to determine when the new state government was

²⁵ 34 Georgia, 355 (1866).

²⁶ 35 Georgia, 47 (1866).

republican in form.²⁷ Thus the memory of Confederate courts and cases faded.

We glance quickly back over the Confederate legal system to ascertain what points of superiority it may have had over its rival across the Potomac. The merit of a full department of justice in place of a mere consultatory office of attorney general was recognized by the United States, which created the present department of justice in 1870. In consolidating the original jurisdiction of the district and circuit courts, the Confederate States anticipated, by a half century, a similar step in the United States. The folly of two separate tribunals, theoretically with a different bench but practically presided over by the same judge, was recognized in legal circles. Such a system could only invite, and did entail, confusion and waste and costly technicalities. The Southern people, being by long tradition close students of government and having a clean slate before them, naturally freed themselves of this incubus at the very inception of their new Federal government. The various constitutional and statutory changes introduced into the Confederate establishment were, in the main, a decided advance in government, many of which have since been adopted by the United States—and others may yet come with profit.

Many of the questions before the state and Confederate courts, during those days of armed emergency, parallel questions which have arisen in these present days of economic emergency. It would be interesting to discuss some of the forgotten decisions of 1861-1865; but space forbids. It may be said, however, that the Confederate judiciary with remarkable unanimity sustained the emergency acts of the Confederate government.

²⁷ See *Shorter v. Cobb et al.* and *White v. Hart et al.*, 39 Georgia, 285, 306 (1869).

Cincinnati's Reputation During the Civil War

By CHARLES R. WILSON

Three episodes in the history of Cincinnati during 1861 and 1862 have frequently been interpreted to indicate that the Queen City, or at least a very large proportion of her population, was pro-Southern during the early part of the Civil War. These are, first, the election of a Democratic mayor less than two weeks prior to the firing upon Fort Sumter; second, the egging of Wendell Phillips in March of 1862; and, third, the race riot in July of the same year.¹ As a matter of fact, however, to construe these incidents as evidence of a Southern bias is to misunderstand completely the nature of Cincinnati in the sixties. It is the purpose of this paper, therefore, to analyze these episodes briefly in their proper setting, a process which leads to a conclusion somewhat different from the conventional one.

Why was it, then, unless a decided Southern affinity be granted, that Cincinnati elected a Democrat—and one who “probably represented ‘the extreme sentiment of deference and concession to the Southern people’ ”²—as mayor in 1861? The answer is to be found in certain

¹ C. T. Greve, *Centennial History of Cincinnati and Representative Citizens* (Chicago, 1904), I, 815, 825; David C. Shilling, “Relation of Southern Ohio to the South during the Decade Preceding the Civil War,” in *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio*, VIII (1913), 13; Whitelaw Reid, *Ohio in the War* (Cincinnati, 1868), I, 86. See also Charles F. Goss, *Cincinnati, the Queen City, 1788-1912* (Chicago, 1912), I, 206, 210; *History of Cincinnati and Hamilton County: Their Past and Present* (Cincinnati, 1894), 344, 357; E. M. Coulter, “Effects of Secession upon the Commerce of the Mississippi Valley,” in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, III (1916-1917), 285. Greve understood clearly that the Wendell Phillips imbroglio did not represent pro-Southern sympathy (*Centennial History of Cincinnati*, I, 813-14, 822).

² Greve, *Centennial History of Cincinnati*, I, 815.

social and economic conditions in the city which predisposed Cincinnati, without favoring one section over the other, to urge peace between them and to demand the maintenance of the Union with the smallest possible degree of friction.

There really was less reason for Cincinnati to be pro-Southern than pro-Northern in 1860. The widespread impression that because of blood connections, social contacts, and economic bonds she was under the domination of the planter South will not stand examination.³ The eighth Federal census quickly disposes of the matter of strong blood ties with the South. It reveals that in the city's population of 157,313 whites only about 6000 were native Southerners; that nearly 46 per cent—more than the number who were Ohio born—were European immigrants; and that the remainder more than twice the number of Southern born had come from the various Northern states.⁴

The city directories and newspapers and the reports of the Ohio secretary of state indicate that there was little Southern social influence on Cincinnati as a whole. None of the Southern religious denominations was represented among her 103 churches, while Cincinnati was the home of such unconditionally Northern families as the Tafts, the Beechers, and the Longworths, to say nothing of Salmon P. Chase and Rutherford B. Hayes. Furthermore, three of her four major daily newspapers, as well as her chief German daily, were Republican, and normally the city was Republican in politics.⁵

The reports of the board of trade and of the chamber of commerce undermine completely the idea of inordinate economic influence from the South. They show clearly that by 1860 Cincinnati's economic well-being no longer depended essentially upon distributive commerce, but

³ This whole matter is made the subject of a more detailed study by the present writer in a forthcoming issue of another historical journal under the title, "Cincinnati a Southern Outpost in 1860-1861?"

⁴ *Population of the United States in 1860 Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census under the Direction of the Secretary of the Interior* (Washington, 1862), I, 612.

⁵ *Williams' Cincinnati Directory, City Guide, and Business Mirror for 1860* (Cincinnati, 1860), *passim*; *Ohio State, Executive Documents, 1860*, Pt. I, 287 (for returns in the election of 1860).

upon manufacturing; and that, due to ample railroad facilities connecting her with the Eastern ports and new Western markets, the bulk of even her remaining commerce, distributive and otherwise, was no longer with the South.⁶ This is not to deny the great importance of the South in Cincinnati's economic life. It is merely to state that the South no longer played the dominant rôle.

Cincinnati was really neither pro-Southern nor pro-Northern. Whatever sectionalism she revealed was Western, but, as a matter of fact, she tended to discount even this in the interest of the Union.⁷ She was unionist to the core, and that is not difficult to understand. Her population was made up of people from all states, sections, and even countries. As a pivotal point around which the three great sections centered, she had intimate ties and friendly intercourse with all. Economically, she found each of the sections in some way as indispensable as the others.

Thus in case of a permanent separation between the North and the South, Cincinnati would become a border city exposed to paralyzing attack whenever a disagreement should arise between the United States and the Southern Confederacy. As a result, capital would retire to a safe spot in the interior of the North, and the Queen City's greatness would become a thing of the past. Again, if the Confederacy should choose to erect a tariff wall against the North and close the Mississippi to Western commerce, the prosperity of Cincinnati would be seriously curtailed. Quite as important, perhaps, was the fact that with the withdrawal of the South from the Union, Cincinnati, together with the remainder of the West, would be reduced to a mere tail on the

⁶ *Annual Statement of the Commerce of Cincinnati for the Commercial Year Ending August 31st, 1860* (Cincinnati, 1860), *passim*; Charles E. Cist, *Cincinnati in 1859* (Cincinnati, 1859), for the board of trade report; Joseph Nimmo, *Report on the Internal Commerce of the United States*, 46 Cong., 3 Sess., 1880-1881, House Ex. Doc. no. 7, Pt. II, 76-77; Sidney D. Maxwell's report to Joseph Nimmo, *ibid.*, appendix, 234-35; E. D. Mansfield in F. W. Hurr, *Cincinnati Guide and Business Directory for 1857-1858* (Cincinnati, 1857), 18; Hugh McCulloch, *Men and Measures of a Half Century* (New York, 1888), 43.

⁷ For an excellent example of the blending of Western sectionalism and nationalism, see *Cincinnati Daily Enquirer*, January 6, 1857. The essential point is that nationality seemed indispensable to Western interests.

Eastern kite, subject to merciless exploitation at the hands of dominant New England. Disunion, in whatever form, therefore, would be disastrous to her.

Yet there was more than an economic background to Cincinnati's unionism. There was a sincere patriotism, a pride in the accomplishments of the American State, a warm, sentimental attachment to the Union which had given the West birth. There was a deep-rooted solicitude for American prestige and safety in the world at large. Finally, there was a pronounced feeling of obligation to humanity, for the belief was that if the American experiment were discredited by war and disruption, mankind the world over would suffer in consequence of the collapse of the democratic ideal.

But while Cincinnati was strictly unionist, she did not feel that war was an advisable means of endeavoring to preserve the Union. In the first place, she was rather disposed to doubt that the South could be conquered, but, even if it could, she feared a consequent psychological disunion which might be even more real than political separation. Second, war was certain to upset the nicely balanced economic relationships of the sections, and to interrupt the profitable business Cincinnati was driving under the Union. Furthermore, it would certainly witness the repudiation of the Southern debt due the city's merchants, while its inordinate demands for men and money might conceivably be the death of constructive economic endeavor. Again, war would endanger the city physically, for Cincinnati was almost certain to become a battleground between the contending sections, subject to all the horrors which war entails. Finally, war would be destructive to the federalistic concept of government, and would likely culminate in the strangling of individual liberty.

Both permanent separation and war, then, were unthinkable to Cincinnati in 1860. The Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, gauging the city's latent sentiment quite accurately, early took a stand for noncoercion and compromise as the best solution of a troublesome problem. It boldly called upon Lincoln for immediate action of a conciliatory nature in order to allay the fears of all reasonable men in the South and to

arrest the progress of secession there. To bring such pressure to bear as to cause him to act, it suggested that a border states convention be summoned to meet in Louisville early in January which would draft a plan by which the North and the South could be held together. But Lincoln was adamant, while the convention proposal aroused little enthusiasm in a North which still believed that the Southern states were bluffing.⁸

But that the *Enquirer* was hardly outrunning public opinion locally is indicated by the huge Union meeting, held in Pike's Opera House on December 19, which placed the city on record as favoring conciliation and peace. The difficulty was, however, that the meeting was noncommittal as to how peace could best be guaranteed. Its resolutions clearly revealed the will for peace, but they offered no concrete plan for maintaining it.⁹ The *Enquirer*, seeing quickly the need for a specific plan, jumped into the breach with ardent advocacy of the Crittenden Compromise,¹⁰ recently introduced into Congress, whose essential proposal was the extension of the Missouri Compromise line to the sea.¹¹

This action aroused considerable opposition from the Republican papers, which understood clearly that the endorsement of the Crittenden plan would embrace repudiation of the central plank in their party platform. Therefore, they bitterly attacked the *Enquirer's* move, attempting to cry the plan down as contradictory to the desires of Cincinnatians. But the *Enquirer* outmaneuvered them, and, probably as a result of undercover work by its owners, and certainly due to the efforts of other Democratic leaders, a second mass meeting was held, this time at Smith and Nixon's Hall on December 31. The meeting voted overwhelmingly, albeit in an atmosphere of railroading tactics, to accord the Crittenden Compromise "our most cordial response and approval."¹² Probably sentiment in Cincinnati had not yet fully

⁸ *Ibid.*, December 5, 6 [7], 11, 12, 13, 25, 1861.

⁹ Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, *Daily Gazette*, *Daily Enquirer*, December 20, 1860.

¹⁰ Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, December 30, 1860, *et. seq.*

¹¹ *Cong. Globe*, 36 Cong., 2 Sess., Pt. I, 114 (December 18, 1860).

¹² Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, *Daily Gazette*, *Daily Enquirer*, January 1, 1861.

crystallized, but this incident called the city's attention to the Crittenden plan in pointed fashion and stimulated thought along the line of real concession.

In the politico-journalistic debate which ensued, the *Enquirer* and the Democrats were accused not merely of playing politics and misrepresenting the opinion of Cincinnati; they were openly charged with aiding and abetting treason.¹³ The *Enquirer* calmly parried these thrusts with considerable finesse, and, in spite of terrific abuse, it continued to hammer away upon the Crittenden plan.

Eventually it began to get results. A series of events revealed that Cincinnati's sentiment had reached the point of demanding the adoption of the compromise measures. The first straw in the wind was the attempt of the Republican press to avoid a showdown on the issue. Immediately after the firing on the *Star of the West*, the *Gazette* coolly announced that there was no longer any middle ground and that there were no parties left except the Unionists and the Disunionists.¹⁴ Second, a committee appointed by the mayor in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Pike's Opera House meeting recommended that the city council authorize the submission of the Crittenden Compromise to a popular referendum. Third, petitions in favor of the Crittenden plan were circulated throughout Cincinnati, and, "signed by six thousand persons," were forwarded to Congress where they were presented to the House by George H. Pendleton, representative from the first district. Fourth, a large mass meeting in the second district voted to instruct its Republican representative to support the Crittenden plan.¹⁵ Fifth, the influential *Catholic Telegraph* came out flatly in favor of peace and union through compromise.¹⁶ Finally, and perhaps most important of all, the *Commercial* suddenly aban-

¹³ Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, January 1, 3, 1861; Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, January 2, 7, 1861.

¹⁴ Cincinnati *Daily Gazette*, January 11, 1861.

¹⁵ Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, January 19, 22, 1861. See also *Cong. Globe*, 36 Cong., 2 Sess., Pt. II, appendix, 70 (January 18, 1861). Pendleton said that the petition contained ten thousand names.

¹⁶ *Catholic Telegraph*, January 22, 29, 1861.

doned its policy of war to the knife and the knife to the hilt and veered around to that of permitting the South to secede peaceably.¹⁷

Feeling now quite sure of its ground, the *Enquirer* accepted the earlier Republican challenge that the Crittenden Compromise did not represent the will of the city and pushed it forward as the main issue in the municipal election of 1861. This seemed justified inasmuch as the Republican members of the city council, through a technicality, had succeeded in blocking a referendum of the plan. Addressing the Democratic City Executive Committee "without meaning in the remotest degree to dictate its policy," the *Enquirer* suggested that steps be taken to give the citizens an opportunity to show that they "are in favor of the Union, and that to preserve it they are willing to compromise the slavery question." The committee responded wholeheartedly to the suggestion, and, calling upon the late Constitutional-Unionists to join with them, announced that the issue in the campaign was to be "Union by conciliation, or Disunion by coercion and civil war."¹⁸

A cut and dried fusion ticket, worked out in caucus, was whipped through the Democratic-Union city convention, and only one resolution was adopted as a platform. This stated baldly "our hostility to all sectional parties," and recommended "to our countrymen to join us in opposition to all such parties on the basis of Senator Crittenden's Compromise."¹⁹ The issue was more or less squarely joined when the Republicans adopted a plank providing that "we emphatically repudiate the doctrine of the Secessionists and their sympathizers, which requires the United States to submit to be forcibly deprived of its property and rights and denounces as 'coercion' every vigorous effort of the General Government to defend or maintain its authority."²⁰ The Democratic nominee for mayor was George Hatch; the Republican, Charles Wilstach.

¹⁷ Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, January 31, 1861.

¹⁸ Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, March 13, 24, 1861.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, March 24, 1861.

²⁰ Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, March 21, 1861.

The result of the election was a complete vindication for the *Enquirer's* policy. Hatch was elected by "a larger majority than was ever before obtained by any mayor of Cincinnati," and the entire Democratic-Union ticket was swept into office by majorities of from two to four thousand. Even Rutherford B. Hayes, running for city solicitor, was defeated, although he ran ahead of his ticket.²¹ But before the Democrats could redeem their pledge to test the city's sentiment upon the Crittenden plan, Fort Sumter was fired upon, and all hope for compromise was swept away in the tidal wave of indignation which engulfed the North.

This entire episode, then, was not an example of Cincinnati's sympathy with the South and secession. It merely represented the city's overwhelming desire for peace and the Union as it was. It is largely in terms of this same sentiment that the egging of Wendell Phillips on the night of March 24, 1862, is to be explained.

The fact is that because of its eagerness for peace and the old Union, Cincinnati seems to have had little desire for the war to be turned into an Abolition crusade.²² But to interpret this as indicating sympathy for the South is to ignore fundamental considerations and to reach a strained conclusion. Actually, Cincinnati opposed emancipation first of all because many of its citizens felt certain that the freeing of the slaves would constitute an insurmountable barrier to the peace they so ardently desired. If the slavery question were ignored, they believed, the South would be willing to take its old place again under the Stars and Stripes, but if it were not, the war would go on indefinitely and perhaps culminate in Southern success. In the second place, they were opposed to the idea of emancipation by presidential proclamation because they feared that such an action would be merely the first step in the establishment of a consolidated,

²¹ Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, April 2, 3, 1861.

²² This seems clearly to be the case in spite of the demonstrations in Cincinnati at the time of the removal of Frémont (James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850* [New York, 1920], III, 370-71). The city elected two Democratic congressmen in the fall of 1862, when the Emancipation Proclamation was one of the chief issues.

centralized despotism. Thus, even if the North should subdue the South, the Union as it was would be merely a fond memory.²³

But there is another important factor which enters into the background of Cincinnati's rough treatment of Phillips. That is the city's attitude toward the free Negro. Emancipation, it was believed, would deluge all southern Ohio with tens of thousands of colored freemen who would create serious problems of a social and economic nature for the indigenous population. "Hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of slaves . . . will come North and West," warned the *Enquirer*, "and will either be competitors with our white mechanics and laborers, degrading them by the competition, or they will have to be supported as paupers and criminals at the public expense."²⁴ Cincinnati's blood chilled at the prospect of Africanization.

In spite of the state of public sentiment, Wendell Phillips was brought to the city for a public address at a time when there was a considerable amount of tenseness lest the President give way to the Radical members of his party and proclaim the slaves free. Phillips' initial reception, when he stepped upon the platform at Pike's Opera House, was somewhat ominous, for the cheers were interspersed with a considerable number of groans and hisses. Nevertheless, the audience was comparatively orderly until the speaker condemned the South as an aristocracy whose right hand was Negro slavery and whose left was the ignorant white man, a society not to be compared with the Northern democracy of industry, brains, and money. This sounded like the preface to a defense of emancipation. There was a stir in the gallery, and suddenly "a heavy boulder was thrown from the third tier of boxes." It struck only a few feet from the speaker and "came crashing among the foot-lights like a cannon shot." At the same time came a couple of eggs "that burst like bombs, dispensing a perfume more potent than fragrant." One of them struck Phillips squarely, to the delight of the rowdy element. The air was rent "by a series of yells like nothing unless it be the war-whoop of a score of infuriated

²³ Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, July 24, November 12, 13, 1861.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, April 18, 1862.

Indians: 'Down with the traitor,' 'Egg the nigger Phillips,' and a dozen other opprobrious epithets." Phillips stood quietly until the disorder had subsided somewhat, then resumed speaking. Shortly after, he had the misfortune to state that for thirty years he had been an Abolitionist and for sixteen years a disunionist. These were dangerous words in a city which had much to lose and little to gain from war, disunion, or emancipation, and the remark brought forth a perfect deluge of missiles.

Phillips continued to speak, however, but his address was punctuated with bursting eggs, while the uproar was so great that a large part of what he said was inaudible. When it was evident that he intended to finish in spite of this discouragement, the rowdies changed their tactics, and, with cries of "Lynch the traitor," "Hang the nigger," and "Tar and feather the Abolitionist," they came piling down the stairs and rushed the stage. At this point the melee became general. Stools and umbrellas were freely used, ladies fainted, and finally a threat was made to cut off the gas, which might have resulted in a panic. Phillips was thereupon induced to cease his endeavors and the meeting was finally dispersed, but a gang of plug-uglies waited for him on the outside. He was perhaps saved from personal violence only by being "disguised and passed out through the crowd undetected."²⁵

Such an episode was a disgrace to Cincinnati, and the press of the city was unanimous in condemning it. But there is little which is surprising about it. Under the circumstances, Cincinnati's strong-arm element could hardly have been expected to deal otherwise than it did with a man who coupled his advocacy of emancipation with the boast that he was a proponent of disunion. Only by the most tortuous reasoning can the affair be twisted into evidence of sympathy for the South.

The same may be said of the race riot in Cincinnati some three months later. The causes were local and immediate, involving the matter of wages and Negro competition with the whites. Most of

²⁵ Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, *Daily Commercial*, *Daily Gazette*, March 25, 1862.

the rioters never saw beyond the situation at hand. Their actions reveal that. Any who may have thought in terms of national implications probably viewed the whole matter in the light of a protest against emancipation and not as aid and comfort to the Confederacy. It is hard to see how they could consider it otherwise. Nevertheless, White-law Reid probably felt that some insidious Southern influence was at work, for he noted significantly that the rioting was to be explained by the fact that most of the Cincinnati police force had gone to Lexington, Kentucky, to aid in defending it from Morgan's raiders.²⁸

The difficulty originated on the levee when a steamer departed manned by an all-Negro crew which had been recruited at wages lower than white deckhands demanded. For several days subsequently, it was unsafe for a Negro to pass the public landing, but on July 10, a group of blacks, banded together for protection, appeared on the wharf. The consequence was a knock-down-drag-out fight, involving about a hundred men. From the river, the excitement spread northward through the city, the Irish element, which had the most to lose from Negro competition, becoming particularly pugnacious. No Negro dared show his face on the streets, for if he did, "he was sure to be knocked down and badly beaten unless his activity in skedaddling would insure his escape." With succeeding days, the bitter feeling intensified rather than abated, for present competition paled into insignificance as compared with the danger of that in the future as the number of Negroes should increase indefinitely. Apparently, the feeling among the aggrieved white laborers was that their economic security could be safeguarded only by giving Cincinnati the reputation of being an undesirable and inhospitable center for Negroes.

Accordingly, on the night of July 15, a mob of no fewer than a thousand men assembled at Sixth and Broadway, from whence, after being doubly stimulated by soapbox oratory and "red-eye" whisky, it launched an attack on "Bucktown." What police remained in the city, if not actually sympathetic, were at least helpless in the situation, and the mob swept all before it. Fortunately for all concerned, the

²⁸ Reid, *Ohio in the War*, I, 86.

Negroes discreetly remained out of sight, and consequently no one was seriously injured, although there was a considerable amount of shooting and much property damage as the rioters ruled the city until dawn. By the end of the following day, the city authorities again had matters under control, and the resentment which had flared up like a rocket was dissipated as quickly as it had appeared.²⁷

Again the press of the city was united in its denunciation of the proceedings. There was some bickering back and forth as to the responsibility of Democrats or Republicans for the rioting, and some fruitless effort to maintain that an almost simultaneous riot in Toledo proved a treasonable conspiracy to be afoot.²⁸ But as the city quieted down again, it seems to have accepted rather generally the *Enquirer's* statement: "The difficulty—as all concur in stating—grew out of a difference between white and colored hands upon steamboats, the latter working for smaller wages than the former, and therefore being preferred by the employers."²⁹

This entire series of events, then, rather than proving that Cincinnati was a hotbed of Southern sympathy, indicates that the city as a whole was consistent in its loyalty to the Union. It had too many problems of its own to be worrying about those of the South, and its interests were bound up with maintenance of the Union and not with secession. For well-defined reasons of its own, it opposed war prior to the firing upon Sumter, but when war came, it supported the government without stint. It did, however, make a distinction between the government and the administration, and it reserved the right to withhold, for reasons peculiar to itself, support from particular administration policies. Cincinnati's slogan from 1861 to 1865 might well have been "Peace—with the Constitution as it is, the Union as it was, and the negroes where they are." There never was a time when the Stars and Bars would have aroused enthusiasm within the city's limits.

²⁷ See Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, *Daily Enquirer*, *Daily Gazette*, July 11-18, 1862.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Cincinnati *Daily Enquirer*, July 18, 1862.

Jackson's "Rhea Letter" Hoax

By RICHARD R. STENBERG

In a private letter to President James Monroe of January 6, 1818, General Andrew Jackson complained that his instructions to prosecute the Seminole War—authorizing him to cross the Florida border but forbidding molestation of the Spanish posts—were too narrow, and added: "Let it be signified to me through any channel, (say Mr. J. Rhea) that the possession of the Floridas would be desirable to the United States, and in sixty days it will be accomplished," and this "without implicating the government."¹ Ill at the time Jackson's letter arrived, the President did not read it until some months after the Florida invasion. Monroe wrote Calhoun:

I never read that letter until after the affair was concluded; nor did I ever think of it until you recalled it to my recollection by an intimation of its contents and a suggestion that it had also been read by Crawford, who had mentioned it to some person who might be disposed to turn it to some account. . . . I asked Mr. Rhea, in a general conversation, whether he had ever intimated to Genl. Jackson his opinion that the Administration had no objection to his making an attack on Pensacola; and he declared that he never had. I did not know, if the General had written him to the same effect as he had to me, as I had not read my letter, but that he might have led me innocently into a conversation in which, wishing to obtain Florida, I might have expressed a sentiment from which he might have drawn that inference. But he assured me that no such conversation ever passed between us. I did not apprise him of the letter which I had received from the General on the subject, being able to ascertain my object without doing so.²

¹ Andrew Jackson to James Monroe, January 6, 1818, with Monroe's important endorsement, in J. S. Bassett (ed.), *The Correspondence of Andrew Jackson* (Washington, 1926-1933), II, 345-46.

² Monroe to John C. Calhoun, December 28, 1827, in S. M. Hamilton (ed.), *The Writings of James Monroe* (New York, 1898-1903), VII, 139. Monroe stated the same facts in the endorsement cited in n. 1.

Thus in conversation with Monroe, which probably took place in the winter of 1818-1819 (and certainly before 1823, when John Rhea left Congress), Rhea readily admitted that he had neither written Jackson about Florida nor been authorized to do so by Monroe. Jackson's activities in Florida shocked the administration by whom they were deemed utterly unauthorized and censurable.³ The later plea by Jackson's apologists that from Monroe's failure to answer his January letter the General may have inferred sanction of his proposal was as unsound as it was improper.⁴ Jackson asked for an express authorization and hence should have inferred rebuke rather than sanction from the President's silence. The General's private letter of January 6, 1818, read in the light of his subsequent actions, shows that he intended to *force upon the administration* the annexation of Florida; and he openly confessed later, in his "Exposition against Calhoun" (1831), that he had intended to seize and occupy Florida when he entered it. His policy appeared plainly enough in his private letter to Monroe of June 2, 1818, in which he urged upon the President

the importance of the Possession of Fts. St Marks, Gadsden and Barancas . . . to the peace and security of our Southern frontier and to the growing greatness of our nation . . . and [I] hope the government will never yield it, should my acts meet your approbation it will be a source of great consolation to me, should it be disapproved, I have this consolation, that I exercised my best exertions and Judgt. and that sound national policy will dictate holding Possession as long as we are a republick.⁵

³ C. F. Adams (ed.), *The Memoirs of John Quincy Adams* (Philadelphia, 1874-1877), IV, 102-108 (June 18-July 15, 1818). Monroe, in fact, even disfavored Senator John Forsyth's proposed motion in Congress to authorize the President to occupy East Florida. "He said Forsyth's project would be war, and if such a bill should be presented to him by Congress, he would not sign it." *Ibid.*, 66-67 (March 23, 1818).

⁴ This plea was first made by Jackson's close friend and "wirepuller," William B. Lewis, in a letter over the signature "B. B." written at Nashville and published in the Philadelphia *Aurora*, December 15, 1818. The admission that Jackson had received no reply to his January letter decisively refutes Jackson's later version. Lewis's "Narrative" in James Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1860-1861), III, 313. Lewis's letter, noticed with some apprehension by Monroe and his cabinet, perhaps partly caused Monroe to seek the above-mentioned interview with John Rhea. See Adams (ed.), *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, IV, 193-94 (December 17, 1818); William H. Crawford to Calhoun, October 2, 1830, in J. E. D. Shipp, *Giant Days: The Life and Times of William H. Crawford* (Americus, Ga., 1909), 246.

⁵ Jackson to Monroe, June 2, 1818, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jack-*

In 1831 Jackson made public a highly original and startling version of the matter—one so completely at variance with the facts, and so circumstantially narrated, that it cannot possibly be attributed to "bad memory." He declared at that time (through the mouth of the aged Rhea, whom he had brought to Washington from Tennessee for the purpose) that in 1818 the Congressman had actually written him a letter conveying Monroe's authorization to seize Florida, in reply to his January letter to Monroe; that he had received this "Rhea letter" late in February on his march towards Florida; that, when at Washington in the spring of 1819 (where he went to defend himself against the Congressional investigation of his Florida escapade and to overawe his critics), he was told by Rhea that Monroe and Secretary of War Calhoun wanted him to destroy the "Rhea letter"; and that upon returning to the Hermitage in Tennessee he accordingly burned the alleged letter, writing at the same time in his letter book (of copies) the following note on the margin of the copy of his letter to Monroe of January 6, 1818: "Mr. J. Rhea's letter in answer is burnt this 12th April 1819." As a matter of fact, so far from knowing of any authorization for Jackson's seizure of Florida, Rhea had written Jackson on December 18, 1818, after reading such documents on the Seminole War as were published: "I will for one support your conduct, believing as far as I have read that you have acted for [the] public good."⁶

Jackson's original tale, which at his request Rhea obediently set forth in his famous letter to Monroe of June 3, 1831, was pure, deliberate fiction, as James Schouler demonstrated years ago. And when the collection of Jackson's private papers became accessible Schouler was able to announce that they verified beyond cavil or doubt his previous conviction of Jackson's sole authorship of that attempt to distort history by a fabrication.⁷ The Jackson Papers, many of which have now been

son, II, 376-78. Jackson urged annexation even more strongly in a letter of August 10, 1818, to Secretary Calhoun. See also Jackson to R. K. Call, August 5, 1818, in C. M. Brevard, *A History of Florida* (Deland, Fla., 1934), I, 257-58.

⁶ Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, II, 403-404.

⁷ James Schouler, "Monroe and the Rhea Letter," in *Magazine of American History* (New York), XII (1884), 308-22, and reprinted in *id.*, *Historical Briefs* (New York, 1896), 97-120; *id.*, *History of the United States under the Constitution* (New York,

published, show that up to the very eve of his letter to Monroe of June 3, 1831, Rhea confessedly knew nothing of the detailed story which he stated therein—avowedly from memory, but really at Jackson's instigation—and that he merely repeated the whole tale as given to him by Jackson himself in letters written to Rhea earlier in 1831. Jackson knew that his fabricated story would gain greater credit if published through Rhea's mouth, particularly as Rhea was naturally his chief witness. Rhea's letters to Jackson seem clearly to show that he wittingly perjured himself in giving the testimony Jackson asked of him. But the giving of desired *ex parte* testimony was a somewhat common form of friendly service in that day, when Judge Hugh L. White observed sagely, "He is a mean politician who can get no man to lye upon him." In a letter to Jackson of January 4, 1831, Rhea confessed that he knew nothing about the story of a "Rhea letter" which Jackson had broached to him, but asked Jackson to send him the necessary documents so that he could "refresh" his mind and give Jackson a helpful "recollection." Rhea added: "As you are on the defensive I will help you all I can. I desire nothing to be known of me in the business, untill I speak out as fully myself as I can and therefore this letter so far CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL."⁸ In writing to Jackson on March 30, Rhea was still calling for information! Finally Jackson brought Rhea to Washington, and gave him again, in a final letter of instruction, dated June 2, 1831, the story which Rhea simply repeated in his letter to Monroe the next day. Jackson told Rhea in his letter of June 2:

On the 6 of Jan'y 1818 I wrote a confidential letter to Mr. Monroe a copy of which marked A I here inclose you, in which you will find the following expressions. "Let it be signified to me thro any channel, (say, J. Rhea) that the possession of the Floridas would be desirable to the U States and in 60 days it will be accomplished." About the 20 or 22d of February on my way to Fort Scott I recvd your letter informing me, that Mr. Monroe had shown you my confidential letter to him of the 6 of Jan'y 1818 and approved thereof; and further, that ample instructions had been, or would be given on that head. In substance going

1894-1899), III, 68-78; IV, 37-38; *ibid.* (ed. 1913), III, 505; IV, 566; *id.*, "The Jackson and Van Buren Papers," in *Atlantic Monthly*, XCV (1905), 217-25.

⁸ Rhea to Jackson, January 4, 1831, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 221-22. Cf. Rhea to Jackson, March 30, 1831, in *ibid.*, 254-55.

to show, that the course pointed out in my confidential letter to him was approved. I quote from memory—your letter was burned.

Towards the rise of Congress, after the debate on the Seminole question in 1819 had closed, you came to me at Strathers Hotel, and enquired if I had recvd such a letter from you, I replied that I had. You then requested me as an old friend, for gods sake to burn it as soon as I got home. I promised that I would, and did so. This was done on the 12 of April 1819, and is so endorsed on the margin of my letter Book, opposite where the confidential letter is recorded.

The object of this communication is to request you to say, whether the fact as stated, to wit, your request to me to burn the letter is not correct, and whether that request proceeded from any intimation or suggestion, of Mr. Monroe and Mr. Calhoun, or either of them.⁹

Rhea was at Washington with Jackson when this letter was written, a letter which was obviously one of instruction, its last paragraph only reflecting the Old Hero's desire to implicate Calhoun and also his characteristic respect for good appearances. The next day, June 3, Rhea proceeded to write Monroe. After citing Jackson's private letter of January 6, 1818, Rhea categorically told Monroe:

I had many confidential conversations with you respecting General Jackson at that period. You communicated to me that confidential letter, or its substance, approved the opinion of Jackson therein expressed, and did authorize me to write to him. I did accordingly write to him. He says he received my letter on his way to Fort Scott, and acted accordingly. After that war a question was raised in your cabinet as to General Jackson's authority, and that question was got over. I know that General Jackson was in Washington in January, 1819, and my confidential letter was probably in his possession. You requested me to request General Jackson to burn that letter, in consequence of which I asked General Jackson, and he promised to do so. He has since informed me that April 12, 1819, he did burn it.

Rhea concluded by requesting a reply.¹⁰ His letter, sent to Monroe in the form just quoted, had undergone considerable revision in the interest of conciseness, literacy, and intelligibility, a revision undoubtedly made either by Jackson himself or indirectly by him through one of his intimate friends.¹¹ Jackson similarly procured a weak corroborative

⁹ Jackson to Rhea, June 2, 1831, in *ibid.*, 288-89.

¹⁰ Quoted by Schouler in *Magazine of American History*, XII (1884), 319.

¹¹ The long and rambling first draft of Rhea's letter to Monroe, June 3, 1831, was quoted in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 288-89. It does not

statement, dated June 2, 1831, from his old friend John Overton to the effect that Jackson had shown him the "Rhea letter" in 1818—a testimony which Overton (who, like Rhea, plainly knew nothing of the matter until imposed on by Jackson) gave reluctantly.¹²

Jackson purveyed the "Rhea letter" tale in letters to a number of private friends in 1831-1832, coupled with malignant denunciations of Calhoun's "villainy" and "treachery" towards him—a groundless charge which his tale of the "Rhea letter" was intended to prove. He was not altogether consistent in his tale, saying in some of his narratives that he had burned the alleged Rhea letter "in Overton's presence," while stating about Overton in other narratives, "I told him I had burned it." In the fall of 1831 or spring of 1832 Jackson wrote up his tale at great length (with some new details added, evincing a remarkable growth in his peculiar memory), intending to publish it under his own signature accompanied by Rhea's and Overton's affidavits. There are two drafts of this "Exposition against Calhoun."¹³ Jackson was only restrained from publishing this manuscript by the advice of well-wishing friends and his own fearful, better judgment, he having been informed that Monroe had been so ungracious as to set down in writing a complete denial of the "Rhea letter" story before he died in July, 1831.¹⁴ The

materially differ in substance from the revised letter sent to Monroe. This original draft shows plainly Rhea's dotage.

¹² John Overton to Jackson, June 16, 1830, February 3, June 2, 1831, in *ibid.*, 151, 236, 287. In his letter of June 16, 1830, giving his own recollection of the Seminole War, Overton, significantly, made no mention of any "Rhea letter." Jackson's letters to Overton are not extant.

¹³ The final draft of Jackson's "Exposition" was published, from Jackson's papers, by Thomas H. Benton in his *Thirty Years' View* (New York, 1852-1854), I, 169-80. A preliminary draft was published in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 228-36 (incorrectly dated "Feb., 1831," by Bassett). See Jackson's letters to friends, from March, 1831, to February, 1832, on the alleged Rhea letter, in *ibid.*, 246, 304, 310, 411; VI, 505; S. G. Heiskell, *Andrew Jackson and Early Tennessee History* (Nashville, 1920-1921), III, 489; *American Historical Magazine and Tennessee Historical Society Quarterly* (Nashville), IX (1904), 89. The last reference is cited hereafter as *American Historical Magazine*.

¹⁴ *Reminiscences of James A. Hamilton* (New York, 1869), 244-45; Hamilton to Jackson, October 20, 1832, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 289 n. Monroe's denial was taken down by his son-in-law, Samuel L. Gouverneur, on June 19, 1831, and was published in Hamilton (ed.), *Writings of James Monroe*, VII, 234-36. Cf. George Morgan, *The Life of James Monroe* (Boston, 1921), 445-52.

Old Hero's action was thus for once "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." Jackson insinuated, indeed, through his organ or mouth-piece, Blair's *Washington Globe*, in the fall of 1831, that he had been fully authorized in his proceedings in Florida in 1818; but when Monroe's literary executor, Samuel L. Gouverneur, wrote Blair that he held private papers of Monroe's bearing on the matter and challenged the editor to say whether Jackson himself authorized the "Rhea letter" story (as put forth in Rhea's letter of June 3, 1831, to Monroe), Blair refused to commit the President, declaring that it was an issue of veracity between Monroe and Rhea, not between Monroe and Jackson! The battle between Gouverneur and Blair waged hotly, at first privately and then in the newspapers, as late as October, 1832, while Jackson continued to remain concealed from the public, finding discretion the better part of valor.¹⁵ Gouverneur could gain no satisfaction, and in 1837, having heard that Jackson was still intending to try to read his fable into history, sent the retiring President, as a silent commentary on his depravity, a copy of Rhea's letter to Monroe.¹⁶

That Jackson was the real author of the slanderous fabrication put forth through Rhea was well understood by interested observers in 1831, who freely expressed for it the contempt which it merited. They likewise easily perceived Jackson's political and personal motives—his desire to prove Calhoun's "treachery" towards him and his desire to place his unauthorized Florida seizure of 1818 in more favorable light before posterity.¹⁷ Calhoun wrote Gouverneur on March 4, 1832: "Should any open move be made in this most nefarious affair by Gen-

¹⁵ Correspondence of Gouverneur and Francis P. Blair, and Duff Green's statements, in *Niles' Weekly Register* (Baltimore), XLIII (1832), 90-94, 104-105, 123; *Washington Globe*, October 4, 11, 1832; Calvin Colton (ed.), *Life and Works of Henry Clay* (New York, 1857), I, 254-56; *United States Telegraph* (Washington), November 7, 1831, June 14, 1832.

¹⁶ Gouverneur to Jackson, January 6, 1837, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, V, 448.

¹⁷ Adams (ed.), *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams*, VIII, 404-405; XII, 210; Henry A. Wise, *Seven Decades of the Union* (Philadelphia, 1872), 151-52; Calhoun to Gouverneur, July 14, 1831, March 4, 1832, in J. F. Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of John C. Calhoun* (American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1899, II), 295, 314; John Floyd's diary, July 16, 1832, in C. H. Ambler, *The Life and Diary of John Floyd* (Richmond, 1918), 192-93; Schouler, "Monroe and the Rhea Letter," *loc. cit.*, 308-22.

eral Jackson . . . it ought to be met directly, and with the indignation, which the character of the transaction is so well calculated to excite. I do not, however, believe any such move will be made. It would not be in character. Crime is cowardly."¹⁸ Jackson was, nevertheless, most anxious to establish his "Rhea letter" story in history. "I have just heard from a respectable source," Calhoun wrote in 1835, "that a book is now writing at Washington under the auspices of Genl. Jackson and to be published when he retires, on the subject of the Seminole affair; in which an attack will be made both on Mr. Monroe's character & my own, and in which the affidavit of John Rhea is to form a prominent part."¹⁹ But still Jackson did not come out openly behind the "Rhea letter" tale, and it remained for Benton to publish Jackson's manuscript "Exposition" in 1852, for the first time, in his *Thirty Years' View* (I, 169-89), thus placing Jackson fully in view.

The fact that even some recent writers half credit and others give full credence to Jackson's fictitious story only shows the strength of the traditional belief in Jackson's reputed honesty without which his tale would not have been able to stand on even one leg to this late day. But most historians have glossed lightly over Jackson's version, perhaps sensing that with a close study of the evidence touching it (and of its "minor" discrepancies in their full implications), it would become too grotesque, too detrimental to the myth of Jackson's integrity, and therefore unfit to dwell upon. More recent writers have generally taken their cue from Professor J. S. Bassett who, in his *Life of Andrew Jackson* (1911), while admitting the falsity of the "Rhea letter" version, held that Jackson was perhaps "honestly mistaken," suggesting that he

¹⁸ Jameson (ed.), *Correspondence of John C. Calhoun*, loc. cit., 314.

¹⁹ Calhoun to Gouverneur, May 22, 1835, in *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, III (1899), 332. From Jackson's manuscript Executive Book (in Jackson MSS., Library of Congress) some pages are cut out, and on the adjacent page appears the following note: "Hermitage 21st Decb. 1842. The leaves of this book cut out at this place were cut by me at the request of Genl Andrew Jackson and contained copies of letters from John Rhea to James Monroe from Andrew Jackson to John Rhea and a statement of John Overton's. All in relation to Genl. Jackson's conduct in the Indian War. James A. McLaughlin." Probably Jackson was sending these copies to Amos Kendall, who was then working on a biography of Jackson, which he never finished. See Kendall to Benton, December 29, 1853, in Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, I, 168 n.

received a letter from Congressman Rhea in 1818 really pertaining to some other matter but which Jackson erroneously believed to relate and be in answer to his request for authorization from Monroe to seize Florida.²⁰ Unfortunately, this ingenious effort to shield Jackson from an open exposure of his dishonesty and insidious intriguing is obviously unsuccessful. For the private correspondence between Monroe and Jackson of July-December, 1818, in which Monroe directly reproved Jackson for violating his orders and acting on his own responsibility in Florida, and in which the General sought to justify his acts solely on the ground of his military orders of December 23, 1817 (which contemplated merely the quelling of the Seminole Indians), shows conclusively that Jackson had no belief whatever that his acts had been previously secretly authorized or sanctioned by Monroe.²¹ This fact appears also in Jackson's letter to Monroe of June 2, 1818, quoted earlier in this paper. Jackson in his correspondence with both Monroe and the war department in 1818 had pretended that his seizure of the Spanish posts was dictated by the exigencies of the Indian campaign and that he had not formed an intention to occupy them prior to his actual entry into Florida. Thus in his letter of April 26, 1818, to Calhoun, Jackson wrote that, having taken St. Marks and completely put down the Indians, he was about to return to Nashville, the purpose of his campaign having been accomplished—at least so far as the instructions given him by the government were concerned. This letter, to be sure, was but a typical piece of Jacksonian duplicity, anent which the Lacock Committee reported to Congress in February, 1819, after investigating the Seminole War: "It appears, however, by the conduct of the commanding general that he had, at this time, looked to different movements, for, at the time he was writing this letter, as will be seen by the testimony of Captain Call and Surgeon Bronaugh, he had des-

²⁰ Professor Bassett stated: "I venture a possible explanation of the discrepancy between the statements of Monroe and Jackson, mostly a conjecture for it cannot be proved." J. S. Bassett, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1911 and 1923), I, 249 n.; Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, II, 348 n.

²¹ Correspondence quoted in Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson*, II, 518-28, and in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, II, *passim*. Jackson's correspondence with the war department in 1818 was printed in *American State Papers, Military Affairs*, I, 681-709.

patched Lieut. Sands to Mobile, to forward on a train of artillery to a given point, to be ready to be made use of in reducing Pensacola and the fort of Barrancas."²² And soon afterwards Jackson descended on Pensacola on the Indian pretext, again pretending that his movement was an afterthought.

Jackson's story that he destroyed a letter from Rhea in 1818 is so plainly a deliberate fraud that no further space need be devoted to showing the fact. Its appearance in 1831 was occasioned by Jackson's desire to "prove" the charge of "treachery" which he preferred against Vice-President Calhoun in May, 1830, as a pretext for breaking with him and for seeking his political destruction. Plentiful testimony shows, and Jackson himself finally confessed, that long before this, in the years 1819-1825, he had been informed by various men (whose reliable knowledge in the matter he could hardly have doubted) of Calhoun's true position in Monroe's cabinet in 1818 on the question as to whether General Jackson should be upheld or punished for his arbitrary conduct.²³ Up to his election as president, Jackson chose to ignore the matter from motives of policy. It appears plainly enough that Jackson's professed "surprise" in the winter of 1829-1830 upon being apprised "for the first time" of the truth of the matter was sheer artful pretense and hypocrisy, assumed as a convenient pretext for making a sudden onslaught on Calhoun, who had grown obnoxious to him and whose

²² Jackson to Calhoun, April 26, 1818, in *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, IV, 600; Lacock Committee report, February 24, 1819, in *American State Papers, Military Affairs*, I, 741. For other instances of Jackson's hoaxing and unscrupulous intrigue, see the following papers by the writer: "Jackson, Buchanan and the 'Corrupt Bargain' Calumny," in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LVIII (1934), 61-85; "Jackson, Anthony Butler, and Texas," in *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XIII (1932), 264-86; "The Texas Schemes of Jackson and Houston, 1829-1836," in *ibid.*, XV (1934), 229-50; and "Jackson's Neches Claim," in *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, XXXIX (1935-1936). The writer is preparing an extensive critique of Jackson's career and character.

²³ Jackson finally admitted, in his "Exposition against Calhoun," that he had been informed of the matter, from 1819 to 1825, not only by his own friends but by some of Crawford's most intimate friends, such as Cobb; but Jackson would have us believe that he refused to believe, that he "could not" believe, these informants! Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 233; cf. John Williams to Van Buren, March 22, 1831, in *ibid.*, 229. This claim of Jackson's stands in strange contrast to his readiness to believe in 1829-1830!

political aid he no longer needed. Calhoun did not believe Jackson sincere and wrote a friend on April 10, 1831: "I believe that Jackson was apprized, as far back as 1825, when he and Crawford were reconciled, of the part I took in the Cabinet, through Cobb as fully as he is now, and that the information was repeated in 1828."²⁴ Calhoun observed later, with much truth, that the real cause of Jackson's animosity towards him and the cause of the one-sided quarrel of 1830 was his, Calhoun's, independence and failure to toady to and flatter Jackson, who was ever condescending and eager for adulation and slavishness on the part of those around him.²⁵ Van Buren's obsequiousness towards Jackson and Calhoun's independence (not to forget, too, *l'affaire* Peggy Eaton, in which Mrs. Calhoun's independence was of some importance in bringing about the breach between Jackson and Calhoun) may be accounted large factors in shaping the trend of political affairs in the period after Jackson's accession to power.²⁶

There remains to discuss a point of some interest about the "Rhea letter" affair, namely, the probable date of Jackson's actual fabrication of this hoax—the date of his writing the marginal forgery (as presumptive proof of the story) in his letter book, "Mr. J. Rhea's letter in answer is burnt this 12th April 1819." And at this place it may be noted that Jackson's letter book for the year 1818 has disappeared. In the Jackson Papers we find only one extant copy of Jackson's letter to Monroe of January 6, 1818—a copy made by and in the handwriting

²⁴ Copy in the Jackson MSS., LXXIX.

²⁵ W. M. Meigs, *Life of Charles J. Ingersoll* (Philadelphia, 1900), 266-67.

²⁶ Calhoun, who at times during his career had almost prophetic insight into misfortunes to come, in later life related to his friends the vision that passed before his mind when his wife told him (in 1829), "Mr. Calhoun, I have determined not to return Mrs. Eaton's visit": "I have heard that a drowning man will sometimes see, at a glance, his whole past life, and, at these words, it seemed as though the future was shown me in as sudden and as vivid a manner. The rupture with General Jackson; the administration changing from a Free Trade policy to that of Protection; the failure to adjust the Tariff difficulties; executive patronage brought to bear upon the States' Rights leaders; personal property influencing the masses; certain Nullification by South Carolina, and almost as certain attempt at coercion by the Federal Government." On recovering from his reverie, Calhoun merely replied to his wife: "That is a question about which women should feel, not think. Their instincts are the safest guides. I entirely concur with you in your decision." Reminiscence of "a prominent South Carolinian" (as the editor identifies the writer), in the *Southern Review* (St. Louis), XII (1873), 216-17.

of Andrew Jackson, Jr., and endorsed: "(a true copy) Attest A. Jackson Jr."²⁷ In the margin of the letter, opposite Jackson's suggestion that Monroe send him an authorization to seize Florida through "any channel (say Mr. J. Rhea)," we find Jackson's marginal note, or forgery; but it reads: "Mr. J. Rhea's letter in answer is burnt this 12th April 1818." Is this date, "1818," a mere slip in copying on the part of Andrew Jackson's adopted son—or did Jackson date the alleged burning of the Rhea letter "1818" in his original marginal note? As we have not Jackson's original letter book, we cannot answer this question. It may be suggested that if Jackson intended at first to bring forth a simpler version of his story, and date the alleged burning in 1818, he probably decided later to change the date of burning to 1819 (placing it after an alleged interview with Rhea at Washington, thereby to ground it upon Monroe's and Calhoun's request) the better to demonstrate Calhoun's "villainy" towards him.

The evidence provides us two hypothetical dates for Jackson's fabrication of the "Rhea letter" hoax, 1827 or 1830-1831. There is no mention or intimation of a "Rhea letter" in any documents written before May, 1830—at which time Jackson broke with Calhoun and threatened him mysteriously with "evidence" he intended to produce "hereafter, when I shall have more leisure, and the documents at hand . . . which will give a very different view of this subject. . . . I had authority for all that I did" in Florida. Later in the same year Jackson applied to Rhea for perjured testimony. On its face this would strongly suggest that the hoax was conceived by Jackson in 1830, as a means of "framing" Calhoun.

There is some evidence, however, which, though written in 1832, may indicate that Jackson had secretly conceived the self-palliative tale (and concocted the accompanying *pièce de résistance*, the marginal forgery) in 1827, when the circumstances or political background, while somewhat different from those of 1830, were such as would very similarly tempt and inspire Jackson's mind to conceive such a fabrication. In 1830 Jackson's predominant passion was hatred of Calhoun;

²⁷ In Jackson MSS., XLVI.

in 1827 he was angry at Monroe who had been quoted to him as having made an aspersion upon Jackson's conduct in the Southern wars of 1814-1815, and a copy of whose letter to Secretary Calhoun of September 9, 1818, was put into Jackson's hands by Sam Houston in January, 1827. In this letter Monroe, speaking of *their* disagreement with Jackson's view of his military orders in the Seminole War, advised Calhoun to write and ask the General to set down his views fully in writing, so that the positions of both parties should plainly appear in the public archives.²⁸ Jackson also heard a rumor in the spring of 1827, so he says, that Monroe was engaged in "writing a book" in which he meant to attack Jackson's unauthorized Florida invasions of 1814 and 1818.²⁹ Though this rumor now seems chimerical, Jackson's letters in 1827 show that he was seemingly upset by the prospect of Monroe's coming out against him in an elaborate *exposé*, in virtual support of his rival Adams in the then presidential contest; and he said some harsh things about Monroe. Jackson, in short, may have conceived his "Rhea letter" hoax in 1827, with the aim of bringing it before the world to offset a prospective attack by Monroe in case it should materialize.

In January, 1832, Jackson instructed his "wire-puller," William B. Lewis, to write to Major Henry Lee—who had lived with Jackson at the Hermitage in 1827-1828 while writing campaign pamphlets for him and working on the Old Hero's biography—to ask Lee if when he was staying with Jackson in 1827

he did not have a view of a confidential [letter] of mine to Mr. Munroe . . . dated in January 1818. . . . and whether he did not see marked on the margin of said letter book, that Mr. John Rheas letter in reply to his confidential letter had been burnt on the 12th day of April 1819 . . . and whether Major Lee did not express great astonishment that I should have so destroyed, when I in-

²⁸ Calhoun pointed out in 1830 that this letter of September 9, 1818, alone must have shown Jackson as early as 1827 (when it came under his eye), if he had not known long before, that Calhoun had not approved the General's conduct in 1818.

²⁹ See Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, III, *passim*; Jackson to R. G. Dunlap, August 29, 1831, in *American Historical Magazine*, IX (1904), 102. Lewis stimulated apprehension of Monroe's rumored "book" among Jackson's less intimate friends. That even as late as 1829 some of Jackson's friends feared Monroe's rumored *exposé* appears in J. Armstrong to Lewis, August 1, 1829, in Jackson MSS., LXXIII. Jackson had been angry at Monroe previously, in 1822, without good reason. Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, III, 149, 160-61; cf. 362.

formed [him] it was at the earnest personal request of Mr. Rhea, and Mr. Rhea stated at the earnest request of Mr. Munroe, . . . and having so promised I did burn and made that memorandum on the margin to shew I had complied with my promise, and request the Major to state the month and year in which he saw my letter to Mr. Munroe with said entry aforesaid on its margin.⁸⁰

Lee, residing at Paris in 1832, was out of favor with Jackson and avowedly anxious to be restored to good grace, so that his reply to Lewis's inquiry may well be a deliberate perjury to gratify President Jackson. Lewis wrote Lee repeating the substance of Jackson's memorandum. In response Lee wrote Jackson a letter on September 4, 1832, in which, after quoting Lewis's letter at length, he said:

My answer to this inquiry is, that I have a distinct recollection of finding from a memo. in your letter book while I was investigating the Seminole or Florida transactions in Tennessee that you had burnt a letter which contained Mr. Monroes approval of your design to enter ["occupy" rubbed out] Florida in prosecuting the Seminole War and that I expressed to you my surprise at finding you had burnt or destroyed so important a paper. I have a less distinct recollection that that letter was not from . . .⁸¹

At this point the extant document ends midway, the concluding page or pages of Lee's testimony having some time been either lost or destroyed by Jackson, possibly because Lee remembered something therein not suitable to Jackson's purpose. This testimony if true would show that Jackson had written the marginal forgery regarding, and in "proof" of, the alleged "Rhea letter" as early as 1827, for the purpose above suggested. Some color of support is given to this hypothesis by the veiled threat in Jackson's private letter to Duff Green of August 13, 1827: "I have said to major Lee that he can have copies of any correspondence of mine with the government, not confidential. If, as you intimate, Mr. Munroe does come out, then these documents may be

⁸⁰ Jackson's note to Lewis, January, 1832, in Jackson-Lewis MSS. in the New York Public Library, published (incorrectly dated "1837") in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, V, 445.

⁸¹ Henry Lee to Jackson, near Paris, September 4, 1832, in Jackson MSS., LXXXI. This testimonial was enclosed by Lee in another letter to Jackson, of personal nature, dated September 5, 1832, which was published in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, IV, 472.

given to the public. I act on the defensive."⁸² In 1831 Jackson wrote similarly of his apprehension of Monroe's "book" in 1827: "Notwithstanding Mr. Monroe knew that Mr. Rhea's letter to me was burned, he perceived from my letter to Southard that I was prepared at every point, and therefore the project of the Book was abandoned. You seem to have forgotten that Mr. Monroe had charged me with transcending my orders. We were at issue on this point, notwithstanding he approved my conduct (as he professed) on a knowledge of the circumstances which attended it."⁸³

But, on the other hand, Jackson wrote Calhoun as late as May, 1828: "Majr Lee has never seen Mr. Monroe's private correspondence with me, and . . . is, therefore, left to place such a construction upon the public documents as he may conceive they justly deserve . . . ; but without his [Monroe's] request I shall not expose this correspondence to Majr. Lee, or any one else."⁸⁴ Monroe, however, gave Lee permission

⁸² Jackson to Green, August 13, 1827, in *ibid.*, III, 377. Lee had written Jackson on November 18, 1826: "If you think proper to communicate any confidential details either of your public or private life, they shall be sacredly cherished within my own bosom, but they might still enable me to give a juster and firmer colour to your history." *Ibid.*, 318.

Similarly, Jackson tried to make Dr. Robert Mayo, a clerk in the war department, a witness in the "Rhea letter" matter. Sometime in 1831-1832, as Mayo related, Jackson "invited me to his chamber to examine certain documents (which he took from a large trunk, not a bureau or table drawer) in relation to his invasion of the Spanish territory of Florida during Mr. Monroe's administration, and which examination I was invited to make with the view to establish a charge of falsehood he alleged against Mr. Monroe." Sensing the spuriousness of the "evidence" shown him by Jackson, Mayo declined to make an affidavit, and was astonished upon the appearance later, in the *Richmond Enquirer*, of such an affidavit as Jackson required, made by Samuel Gwin, one of Jackson's parasites and favorites, and this soon after Gwin's appointment by Jackson to the land office in Mississippi. It seems that Gwin's testimony did not go to the full extent of Jackson's desire, for Mayo said: "The asperities of the original design were much mitigated, however, in that communication, as to the positive inductions of falsehood; but it bore all the other internal evidences of its origin in the indications of the then tenant of the President's mansion." Mayo, *The Affidavit of Andrew Jackson, taken by the Defendants in the Suit of Robert Mayo vs. Blair & Rives for a Libel, Analised and Refuted, by Robert Mayo* (Washington, 1840), 11. Indeed, in 1830-1831, Jackson had "Florida" on the brain, as appears in his hoax of the "Fulton letter" of December 10, 1830, which was exposed by Robert Mayo in 1838-1839, and which the present writer has discussed in *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XV (1934-1935), 229-38; XIII (1932-1933), 265-66.

⁸³ Jackson to Dunlap, August 29, 1831, in *American Historical Magazine*, IX (1904), 102.

⁸⁴ Jackson to Calhoun, May 25, 1828, in Bassett (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, III, 404-406; cf. Jackson to Green, August 13, 1827, in *ibid.*, 377.

in 1828 to see this correspondence, and Jackson may have shown it to Lee some time in 1827-1828. Yet Lee wrote Jackson as late as 1829:

Genl. Armstrong is about publishing a brief historical summary of the last war, and he had the goodness first to offer it to me, as a material for my promised history of your life; which offer I was compelled to decline, inasmuch as you took back the memo. you once gave me, *and never did shew me the confidential correspondence with Monroe. . . .* Your withholding of materials from me has involved me in another difficulty for Green (who was to bear my expenses in Tennessee and then share the profits of the book) has called on me to refund.⁸⁵

It is probable, in the writer's opinion, that in 1827-1828 Lee was given no intimation by Jackson of the "Rhea letter" story which was brought forth in 1830-1831, and that Lee's testimony in 1832 was perjured like that of Rhea and Overton. It must be noted that Jackson's unscrupulous letter to Monroe of January 6, 1818, was not known to the public until Calhoun published it in paraphrase in his famous pamphlet of February, 1831. Before he issued his "Rhea letter" story in June, 1831, Jackson had not been altogether happy about that private letter of his to Monroe, which so clearly showed his imperialistic frame of mind on the eve of his Florida invasion (and which, at the time, had intimated to Monroe's cabinet members the real motive behind his operations in Florida). He considered Calhoun's publication of that letter⁸⁶ an additional grievance against the South Carolinian. It is quite possible, nevertheless, that Jackson secretly contrived his "Rhea letter" hoax in 1827 or even earlier,⁸⁷ rather than in 1830; but, if so, it is a

⁸⁵ Lee to Jackson, August 20, 1829, in Jackson MSS., LXXIII. Lee complained in other letters to Jackson in 1827-1828 that Jackson had not facilitated his task by giving him access to his private papers. *Ibid.* Lee's biography of Jackson was never finished. Author's italics above.

⁸⁶ In Calhoun's *Correspondence between Gen. Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun, President and Vice-President of the U. States, on the Subject of the Course of the Latter, in the Deliberations of the Cabinet of Mr. Monroe, on the Occurrences in the Seminole War* (Washington, 1831), 49.

⁸⁷ In his "Exposition against Calhoun," Jackson says that his marginal entry in his letter book "was seen by several persons many years ago," but he does not name these "persons." Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, I, 179. Even if he concocted this forgery in 1830 Jackson would naturally wish to make it seem that it had been *known* to have been on record a long time.

little peculiar that he did not at an earlier time solicit a supporting statement or affidavit from Rhea (who had for years been on the verge of the grave, and died in the spring of 1832, shortly after serving as Jackson's tool). In brief, we cannot date the origin of Jackson's hoax with certainty—having before us only the result, and not the paths and processes, of his deliberations—and must leave this among the many unsolved questions which give history its piquancy.

But whether framed to meet the political exigency of 1827 or that of 1830, or framed at some earlier time, Jackson's "Rhea letter" story is a fabrication equally transparent. And his unscrupulous private letter to Monroe of January 6, 1818, upon which his hoax of afteryears was erected, reminds us

How oft the sight of means to do ill deeds
Makes ill deeds done.

Walter Lynwood Fleming: Historian of Reconstruction

By FLETCHER M. GREEN

The subject of reconstruction and the readmission of the Southern states into the Union has attracted the attention of a large number of American historians. These historians have taken widely divergent views, both as to the approach and the interpretation of the period. Some of them have taken the position that the history of reconstruction should concern itself largely with conditions in the seceded states, and they have made the South the core of their study; others have chosen to approach the problem from the opposite pole, and have devoted chief attention to the victorious North rather than to the vanquished South. The contemporary writers on the era almost uniformly took the view that the Southern whites were traitors and that they and their Democratic allies of the North, under the leadership of Andrew Johnson, would if unchecked destroy by the ballot the Union which had withstood the appeal to arms; on the other hand, they regarded the Northern Radicals as the real defenders and saviors of the Union.

A later group of historians saw the conflict between Johnson and the Radicals with less prejudiced eyes. They did not regard Johnson and the Southern whites as traitors but, rather, as loyal and well-meaning citizens who, by resisting the program of the Radicals as first expressed in the Fourteenth Amendment, were responsible for the mistakes and suffering under later Radical reconstruction. This second group, like the first, looked upon reconstruction as a political problem and largely ignored its economic and social aspects. During the more recent years a great mass of literature on the period came from the press. The

recent writers advanced new points of view, both as to the conflict between President Johnson and the Radicals and the fundamental meaning of reconstruction. They not only came to the defense of Johnson but actually pictured him as the wisest and most farseeing statesman of the period. They stressed the social and economic significance of reconstruction rather than its political phases and maintained that reconstruction enabled the industrial North and East to fasten upon the Union an economic philosophy and system which the combined West and South might have defeated, as they had checked it in the generation preceding the Civil War.¹

Among the earliest writers in this new school of reconstruction historians was Walter Lynwood Fleming who died at Nashville, Tennessee, on August 3, 1932. Only fifty-eight years of age at the time of his death, he lived a varied life and, through his teaching and writings, made notable contributions to the field of Southern history. The *American Historical Review*, in announcing his death, said: "As a student and writer he held a leading position in the investigation of different phases of the Reconstruction period."² The faculty of Vanderbilt University, of which Dr. Fleming was a member at the time of his death, did not deem it appropriate "to indulge in fulsome eulogy," but did think "his character, his devotion to the University which he served, and the manly virtues which commanded our love and admiration" worthy of praise. Fleming's magnetic personality and happy and friendly disposition endeared him to student, colleague, and a wide circle of friends and admirers who knew him only to love him.

Professor Fleming was born at Brundige, Alabama, April 8, 1874, the son of William LeRoy and Mary Love (Edwards) Fleming. His parents on both sides were of good Georgia stock who migrated to Alabama in the ante-bellum period. His father, a well-to-do planter, served in the Civil War as a cavalryman in the campaigns around Jacksonville, Florida. He took a keen interest in the problems of recon-

¹ Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (New York, 1930), is an able exposition of this thesis.

² *American Historical Review*, XXXVIII (1933), 182.

struction and his stories of Carpetbag and Scalawag days first aroused in his distinguished son an interest in that period. While public spirited and active in governmental affairs, the elder Fleming was not a politician and except for the post of county tax collector never held office.³ Young Walter grew up on the farm and enjoyed the rural sports of the South as well as endured the hardships of farm life during the years following the Civil War. He attended the public schools of Pike County and prepared for college at the Brundige Academy. He entered the Alabama Polytechnic Institute from which he received the B.S. degree, with honors, in 1896, and the M.S. degree in 1897. A member of the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity, Fleming took an active interest in the extracurricular life of the college. He served on the staff of the *Glomorata* and as editor-in-chief of the *Orange & Blue*. He taught in the public schools of Alabama in 1894-1896 and became an instructor in history and English at his alma mater in 1896-1897. He was assistant librarian 1897-1898 and an instructor in English 1899-1900. He also served as secretary of the Alumni Association, 1896-1898.⁴

Fleming enlisted in the Second Alabama Volunteers on May 1, 1898, and served as a private, corporal, and first sergeant of Company H Infantry in the Spanish-American War. He was promoted second lieutenant in July, 1898, and was transferred to Company A, Third Alabama Infantry. In January, 1899, he was detailed by Brigadier General Royal T. Frank as quartermaster of the field hospital, Second Division, Fourth Army Corps.⁵

³ *Memorial Record of Alabama. A concise account of the State's political, military, professional and industrial progress, together with the memoirs of many of its people* (Madison, Wis., 1893), II, 833-34.

⁴ *Who's Who in America* (Chicago), XV (1928), 779; *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (Philadelphia), XX (1902), 628-29; Thomas M. Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography* (Chicago, 1921), III, 587; *Nashville Banner*, August 3, 1932; J. A. C. Chandler et al. (eds.), *The South in the Building of the Nation* (Richmond, 1909), XI, 348-49. The writer is especially indebted to Mrs. Walter L. Fleming for her generous aid in copying from her scrapbooks information concerning Dr. Fleming's college life, his professional career, and opinions of him expressed by his students, colleagues, and teachers.

⁵ Owen, *History of Alabama*, III, 587; editorial note in the Alabama Historical Society, *Transactions, 1898-1903* (Montgomery), IV (1904), 167.

Leaving the army in 1899, Fleming returned to the farm but his intellectual bent soon asserted itself and in 1900 he began the study of history at Columbia University. After taking the M.A. degree in 1901, he remained at Columbia as a student and lecturer in history until 1904 when he won his doctorate. Two of Fleming's teachers made a powerful impression upon his alert mind. These were Professor George Petrie of Alabama Polytechnic Institute and Professor William Archibald Dunning of Columbia University. The first awakened in him the desire to study and know more about the Reconstruction period in the United States, and the second wisely guided his graduate study and research in that field of interest. Not only did Professor Fleming often allude to his indebtedness and gratitude to these teachers, but he dedicated his monumental two-volume *Documentary History of Reconstruction* to them jointly.

Fleming made just as powerful an impression on his teachers as they on him. Charles H. Ross, Professor of Modern Languages at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, said that Fleming was "the best student" he ever had, and Charles C. Thach, later president of that institution, described him as a man of "strong, native intellect, an untiring student . . . [with] a clear, inquiring, original mind. . . . I regard Mr. Fleming as the best man to whom I have given instruction." Professor Dunning said that as a graduate student Fleming was "an exceedingly able and scholarly man." He "impressed us very strongly with the admirable character of his scholarship, and the strength and breadth of his capacity for dealing with all the problems of history and political science." James Harvey Robinson said that Fleming was a "very strong man and an excellent scholar [who] shows insight and keenness in the use of his materials." And Herbert L. Osgood described him as "full of resource, thoroughly alive, and ready to avail himself of progressive ideas and methods."⁶ Professors John W. Burgess, John Bassett Moore, and William M. Sloane, all of Columbia University, were equally fulsome in their praise of Fleming as a student.

Fleming was called to a professorship of history in West Virginia

⁶ The extracts of letters quoted above were supplied by Mrs. Fleming.

University in 1904. At that time he had already attained a reputation as "an able writer, [and] a conscientious student" and it was prophesied that his election would mean "much for historical enterprise in West Virginia."⁷ This prophecy was quickly fulfilled for Fleming began almost at once the publication of the *West Virginia University Documents on Reconstruction* as a monthly bulletin and shortly thereafter published his *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, the *Ku Klux Klan*, and the *Documentary History* to which reference has already been made. In 1907 Fleming became professor of history in Louisiana State University where he remained for a decade. These years were very fruitful in books and articles on General William Tecumseh Sherman, first president of the institution, and on Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederate States of America. He also began to publish important monographs on Southern history in the *Bulletins* of Louisiana State University. In September, 1917, Dr. Fleming began his duties as Holland N. McTyeire Professor of History at Vanderbilt University. He became Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in 1923 and later Director of the Graduate School. From the beginning of his service, Dean Fleming was recognized as a constructive leader. "As secretary of the Committee on Graduate Instruction, he promoted the organization and development of facilities for graduate study"; and as director of the Division of Social Sciences he brought about the co-ordination of the various departments giving work in that field. His work was largely responsible for the grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund in 1925 for the promotion of research in the social sciences at Vanderbilt University.⁸ He resigned his administrative position in 1926 to devote his full time to teaching and historical writing, but ill health forced him to retire from active work in 1928. Fleming's chief productions while at Vanderbilt were the *Sequel of Appomattox* and the *Freedmen's Savings Bank*, although he continued to contribute frequently to magazines and historical reviews.

As a teacher, Professor Fleming won the esteem of both students

⁷ *Gulf States Historical Magazine* (Montgomery), II (1904), 65.

⁸ *Vanderbilt Alumnus*, XVIII (1932), 5, 15.

and colleagues. He was ever ready and willing to aid an earnest student in his search for materials and information and equally patient with the poor student, but he was intolerant of careless and slipshod work. A former student, now a teacher in a Southern college, wrote: "I have studied under a great many history teachers but Dr. Fleming excels them all. His was the combination of a great heart, a great brain, and rare teaching technique." Another student wrote that Dr. Fleming was one of her "best friends and advisors during my college years, and I hold him in the highest regard. Although I hated history and thought that as soon as I finished the year that I was compelled to take that I would forget all about those classes I attended, I find that the memory of those hours in Dr. Fleming's class is the brightest of my college days."⁹ Again, Fleming gladly gave advice and encouragement to the young and inexperienced instructor and intellectual companionship to the older members of his department.¹⁰ The resolutions of the Vanderbilt faculty upon his death were in no wise overfulsome in praise of him as a teacher and administrator: "When the University opened in September of 1917, Dr. Fleming began his duties as Holland N. McTyeire Professor of History. Indissolubly connected with the chair were the traditions established by Dodd and Bemis and Moore and Sioussat, a grand quarternion. If they, to use the language of 'Flanders Fields' threw the torch to him, it is certain that he caught it and held it high. . . . As a teacher he inspired all who came in contact with him with a love for honest endeavor and true scholarship, upholding in this respect as few others have done, the outstanding tradition of Vanderbilt. . . . With the death of Dean Tolman in November of 1923, Dr. Fleming assumed the duties of Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. His success as an administrator was instantaneous and continuous, and the University owes to him a debt of gratitude which never can be repaid."¹¹ It is no wonder that "Twelve Southerners,"

⁹ Extracts furnished by Mrs. Fleming.

¹⁰ It was the privilege of the writer to be a member of the history staff of Vanderbilt University in 1924-1925, and he cherishes the friendship of, and association with, Dr. Fleming during that period.

¹¹ "In Memoriam," resolutions of the Vanderbilt faculty. Used by permission.

several of whom were Fleming's former students and colleagues, dedicated their book, *I'll Take My Stand*, to this pre-eminent scholar and historian since to him "some of the contributors owe doctrine and example, and all would offer this expression of perfect esteem."¹² Still another tribute from one of the earlier colleagues of Dr. Fleming throws light on the latter's regard for and fair dealings with his colleagues as well as his conception of history: "Doctor Fleming . . . gives a course entitled 'The Civil War and Reconstruction.' We should naturally expect an authority in that period to be rather bigoted as to its importance and apt to dwell overmuch on it, especially when he is the head of the department. The contrary is true in this case. Professor Fleming treats this period from the viewpoint of national development, tracing the various factors, personal, economic, and sectional which made for Secession, together with the results of the ensuing decades. By passing over nonessentials, he saves enough time to trace the effects of this period down to the present."¹³

A layman's estimate of Fleming, the man and historian, taken from the Nashville *Banner* of August 4, 1932, reads as follows: "In the round of every day living with its deadening routine of ordinary things, it is an inspiration to have the influence of those gallant few who tower above the ordinary as did Dean Fleming. All too often we forget that they are with us in the mass of the commonplace. Educator, scholar, and gentleman of the highest type, though he was, Dean Fleming's paramount achievement rested largely in his humanness. In him the true end of learning found its fullest expression. Everything he thought or expressed was tempered with the human attitude, and even when his mind was fully occupied with the most pressing of problems, he was never too busy to sit down for an informal chat with anyone who came to his office."

Professor Fleming's reputation and position among historians led to his selection for much editorial work. He was a contributor to and

¹² Twelve Southerners, *I'll Take My Stand: The South and the Agrarian Tradition* (New York, 1930), v.

¹³ Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., in the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, *Proceedings*, VIII (1915), 314.

editorial reviser of *The Historians' History of the World*, 25 volumes (New York, 1904); a contributor to and editor-in-chief of Section VI, "Biography," volumes XI and XII of *The South in the Building of the Nation*, 12 volumes (Richmond, 1909); and a contributor to *The Photographic History of the Civil War*, 10 volumes (New York, 1911); *Nelson's Perpetual Loose-Leaf Encyclopaedia* (New York, 1905-); the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition, 29 volumes (Cambridge, England, 1911), and Fourteenth Edition, 24 volumes (London, 1929); the *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 volumes (New York, 1928-); and McLaughlin and Hart, *Cyclopedia of American Government*, 3 volumes (New York, 1914). The list of learned journals and reviews to which he contributed would include almost all those of Southern and many of those of national importance in the field of the social sciences.

Professor Fleming took an active interest in the work of the various historical associations. He was a member of the Alabama, Tennessee, the old Southern, Mississippi Valley, and the American Historical associations and of the American Political Science Association and the National Geographic Society. He was a member of the Board of Editors of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* from 1914 to 1922 and served on the Committee for State Historical Museums and the program and nominating committees of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. As a member of the Public Archives Commission of the American Historical Association, he made extended investigations in the archives of West Virginia and Louisiana. He represented the Association on the National Board of Historical Service and also served on the committee on appointments and the general and program committees. He was a member of the Executive Council of the American Historical Association for two terms and served twice as chairman of the John H. Dunning Prize Committee. Fleming appeared on the program of both these associations as well as that of the Alabama Historical Society.

Professor Fleming was a sound scholar and an indefatigable investigator. Fearing that historical materials bearing on the Civil War,

Reconstruction, the Ku Klux Klan, William T. Sherman, Jefferson Davis, and other problems on which he worked might escape his own researches, he printed and circulated handbills requesting information and materials on these subjects and also ran notices to the same effect in the *Gulf States Historical Magazine* and the *Publications* of the Southern History Association.

The "Civil War and Reconstruction" was Professor Fleming's chosen field of specialization and he treated that period of Southern history in his published writings more thoroughly than any other historian. His patient research, discriminating judgment, and clarity of style, together with his voluminous writings, enabled him to become *the* outstanding historian of this period, not even excepting his old master, Professor Dunning. As Horace E. Flack said: "There is probably no one who has devoted so much time and study to an examination of the documents relating to that period as has Dr. Fleming, and he is thus well qualified to exercise discrimination in the selection of those documents which will be of most value to students in general."¹⁴ It is worthy of note that Flack found only one error in the two volumes of documents edited by Fleming. Professor Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer said of Fleming: "We have no higher authority on this theme [Reconstruction] and may likely not see another who shall approach it with his devotion."¹⁵ Herman V. Ames said that Fleming placed "all of us who deal with the Reconstruction period under a debt of gratitude"; Edwin E. Sparks that he had "laid us all under obligation." Frederick A. Ogg, Henry E. Bourne, J. G. de R. Hamilton, John Bassett Moore, and Woodrow Wilson wrote in similar commendatory vein.¹⁶

Woodrow Wilson was so impressed with his writings that he opened a correspondence with Fleming and offered him a position on the Princeton University faculty, which he was forced to decline because of pecuniary reasons. Albert Bushnell Hart corresponded frequently with Fleming, and expressed a desire to become "better acquainted

¹⁴ *American Political Science Review*, II (1908), 99.

¹⁵ *American Historical Review*, XXV (1920), 520.

¹⁶ Walter L. Fleming (ed.), *Documents Relating to Reconstruction* (Morgantown, W. Va., 1904), back flyleaf.

with one who is doing so much to develop American history." Again Hart wrote, "Wherever I touch the current literature of American history, I find something serviceable from your pen." James Ford Rhodes wrote to thank him for his "kind and considerate review of my V. volume," and, in defending himself against one of Fleming's criticisms, said: "You must take into account that in many matters pertaining to the South your information is fuller and more exact than mine."¹⁷

Professor Fleming believed that reconstruction could "be explained only after an examination of ante-bellum and Civil War conditions."¹⁸ He wrote that "The negro is the central figure in the reconstruction of the South. Without the negro there would have been no Civil War. Granting a war fought for any other cause, the task of reconstruction would, without him, have been comparatively simple."¹⁹ In line with these views, he portrayed, in his writings, ante-bellum society and institutions in their various ramifications. He wrote much of economic, social, and religious factors in the Old South. He treated reconstruction "as something more than a political manoeuvre, as a process affecting churches, schools, trades, and professions as well as politics and civil administration,"²⁰ and this, too, in regard to the black as well as the white man. He did not approach his task from a "merely local or antiquarian point of view but aimed to give each local event its true setting in the history of the whole period." Hardly with an exception, the reviewers hailed Fleming's publications as "careful and painstaking," a "welcome contribution," "scientific history of the first order," "exceedingly interesting," and "thoroughly adequate." The one notable exception is the learned Negro historian and educator, Dr. W. E. Burghardt Du Bois. He grouped Fleming's *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* with other Columbia University *Studies* on reconstruction and says they are "one-sided and partisan to the last degree." They

¹⁷ The above information and extracts were furnished by Mrs. Fleming.

¹⁸ Fleming, review of J. G. de R. Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina*, in the *American Historical Review*, XII (1907), 911.

¹⁹ Fleming, *The Sequel of Appomattox* (New Haven, 1919), 34.

²⁰ William O. Scroggs, review of *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, in the *American Historical Review*, XI (1906), 943-44.

were "all based on the same thesis and all done according to the same method: first, endless sympathy with the white South; second, ridicule, contempt or silence for the Negro; third, a judicial attitude towards the North, which concludes that the North under great misapprehension did a grievous wrong, but eventually saw its mistake and retreated." Again Du Bois said: "The works of Fleming are anti-Negro in spirit, but, nevertheless, they have a certain fairness and sense of historic honesty. Fleming's *Documentary History of Reconstruction* is done by a man who has a thesis to support, and his selection of documents supports the thesis. His study of Alabama is pure propaganda." And once again, "These authors [Fleming included] seek the facts in certain narrow definite fields and in most cases do not ignore the truth as to Negroes."²¹ The concessions of Du Bois to Fleming's fairness and sense of historical honesty and accuracy were high praise coming from a man who writes with as much passion as Dr. Du Bois does. Somewhat nearer the exact truth is William O. Scroggs who said that Fleming's "sympathies are decidedly with the South, but the work is free from bitterness or prejudice, and is on the whole as impartial an account as one can expect from any writer on this subject."²²

Because of the thoroughness and intensiveness with which Fleming wrote the history of the Reconstruction era, a bibliography of his writings will prove a valuable guide to the literature of the period. His works include books, edited documents, monographs, magazine and review articles and essays, and book reviews. The last are worthy of note because in some of them he developed more cogently and succinctly than anywhere else his views on personalities and problems of reconstruction. For instance, in one review he characterized President Grant as "an honest but naïve and politically incompetent chief executive" and also criticized the author for devoting insufficient attention to "the constructive economic and social forces in American life which were

²¹ W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction: An Essay toward a History of the Part which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1887* (New York, 1935), 719, 720, 731, 733.

²² *American Historical Review*, XI (1906), 944.

preparing the way for a more genuine reconstruction."²³ Again he expressed the view that "the laws [black codes of 1865], with few exceptions, were timely and sensible, and in substance had long been and still are on the statute books of most of the states of the Union."²⁴

The following bibliography is practically complete, although some fugitive reviews and articles may have escaped the compiler. Not only were the card catalogues of libraries and formal bibliographical guides used but guides to periodical literature were also utilized. The index of every review, journal, or magazine which was a possible repository for any of Fleming's writings was checked and then every one to which he contributed was rechecked, volume by volume. All reprints, whether as separates or in other publications, and different editions of books have also been listed. With very few exceptions, the writer has either checked and verified, or had others to do so, all items listed in the following bibliography.²⁵ With respect to the more important documents and books he has attempted to make the bibliography a critical one. In so doing he has, where possible, quoted the reviews of authorities in the field as printed in the leading historical journals. If the tone of this article seems eulogistic it is the result of quoting from students and reviewers of Dr. Fleming rather than the design of the present writer.

I. EDITED AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

Documentary History of Reconstruction, Political, Military, Social, Religious, Educational & Industrial, 1865 to the Present Time. 2 vols., xviii, 493 and xiv, 480 pp. (Arthur H. Clark Company: Cleveland, 1906, 1907).

"This publication supplies a need, for it brings into comparatively small compass, not what the historian may think of the events of that period, but the documents which relate those events and which give the opinions of those

²³ Fleming, review of Ellis P. Oberholtzer, *A History of the United States since the Civil War*, III, in the *American Historical Review*, XXXIII (1928), 162-64.

²⁴ Fleming, review of Hamilton J. Eckenrode, *The Political History of Virginia During the Reconstruction*, in the *Political Science Quarterly*, XX (1905), 319-21.

²⁵ The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Professor W. H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University, Mr. Thomas P. Govan of Vanderbilt University, Professor Ralph B. Flanders of New York University, and Professor Cecil Johnson and Mr. J. C. Sitterson of the University of North Carolina, in verifying certain items of the bibliography.

living at the time. Dr. Fleming does not attempt to approve or controvert any particular theory, but lets the documents speak for themselves, and his labor will be appreciated by all those who have occasion to make a somewhat careful study of the period to which the documents relate."²⁶ "The first volume consists of selections illustrative of the condition of the South after the war, the problems to be solved and the attempts of the President and Congress to solve them, ending with the readmission of the late Confederate States to the Union." The aim of the second volume "is to illustrate the working out of Reconstruction in the South, with special reference to race relations, political morality, and economic, educational and religious matters. Some material is included to illustrate later phases of certain problems of Reconstruction."²⁷ The introductions to each chapter range from two to four pages in length and total some forty pages. These introductions, together with the list of references, add materially to the value of the documents, coming as they do from a man so thoroughly familiar with the documents and the history of the period.²⁸

Documents Relating to Reconstruction. Eight numbers, 269 pp. (West Virginia University: Morgantown, 1904).

A collection of reprints, selected from newspaper files, public documents, pamphlets, and manuscripts, illustrating peculiar conditions, social, political and economic, that prevailed in the Southern states during reconstruction. Each number has an excellent introduction of from two to six pages which is valuable both as a summary of and comment upon the document.

General W. T. Sherman as College President. A collection of letters, documents, and other material, chiefly from private sources, relating to the life and activities of General William Tecumseh Sherman, to the early years of Louisiana State University, and to the stirring conditions existing in the South on the eve of the Civil War: 1859-1861. 399 pp. (Arthur H. Clark Company: Cleveland, 1912).

A "valuable repository of information" bearing on General Sherman and the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy with a fresh contribution to social and educational conditions in Louisiana on the eve of the Civil War. Professor Fleming "once more put students of war-time history under a great obligation by editing the attractive volume."²⁹

²⁶ Horace E. Flack, review in the *American Political Science Review*, II (1908), 101.

²⁷ Fleming, *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, I, vii; II, v.

²⁸ See the reviews by Hamilton in the *American Historical Review*, XII (1907), 166-67; and by Flack in the *American Political Science Review*, II (1908), 99-101.

²⁹ See the reviews by M. A. DeWolfe Howe in the *American Historical Review*, XVIII (1913), 376-77; and an unsigned review in the *Political Science Quarterly*, XXVII (1912), 564-65.

Ku Klux Klan. Its Origin, Growth and Disbandment, by J. C. Lester and D. L. Wilson, with Appendices Containing the Prescripts of the Ku Klux Klan, Specimen Orders and Warnings, with Introduction and Notes. 208 pp. (Neale Publishing Company: New York and Washington, 1905).

Professor Fleming rendered students of the period a great service in reprinting the Lester and Wilson volume which was first printed privately in Nashville, Tennessee, in 1884, but was in 1905 out of print and quite rare. The forty-four page "Introduction" is not only a valuable essay in historiography but also one of the best succinct accounts of the work of secret orders during the days of reconstruction. The "Appendices" of seventy-five pages contain valuable source documents.

"A Ku Klux Document," in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, I (1915), 575-78.

The above document is the ritual of a local secret organization, Order Number 298, which operated in Florida and Louisiana during the darkest days of reconstruction from 1872 to 1877.

Union League Documents. 36 pp. (Number 3 of West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction: Morgantown, 1904).

The Constitution and the Ritual of the Knights of the White Camelia. 32 pp. (Number 1 of West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction: Morgantown, 1904).

Freedmen's Bureau Documents, and *The Freedmen's Savings Bank*. 64 pp. (Numbers 6 and 7 of West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction: Morgantown, 1904).

Laws Relating to Freedmen, 1865-66. 32 pp. (Number 8 of West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction: Morgantown, 1904).

"The Prescript of Ku Klux Klan," in the Southern History Association, *Publications*, VII (1903), 327-48.

The Prescript of Ku Klux Klan. 22 pp. A reprint (n. p., n. d.).

Public Frauds in South Carolina, The Constitution of the Council of Safety, Local Ku Klux Constitution, and *The '76 Association*. 64 pp. (Numbers 4 and 5 of West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction: Morgantown, 1904).

Revised and Amended Prescript of the Ku Klux Klan. 32 pp. (Number 2 of West Virginia University Documents Relating to Reconstruction: Morgantown, 1904).

Revised and Amended Prescript of Ku Klux Klan. 26 pp. (Department of History, Louisiana State University: Baton Rouge, 1908).

"Some Documents Relating to Jefferson Davis at West Point," in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, VII (1921), 146-52.

These documents are taken from the records of the United States Military Academy at West Point and the judge advocate general's office in the war department.

"Two Important Letters by Jefferson Davis Discovered," in the *Southern Historical Society, Papers*, XXXVI (1908), 8-12.

The two letters bear on the Andersonville prison and are accompanied by an introductory note by the editor clarifying Davis's attitude on prison conditions in the Confederacy.

"Recent Historical Activities in the Trans-Mississippi Southwest," in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, II (1916), 529-60.

An exhaustive bibliographical article with critical notes on books and articles and a descriptive account of historical collections in the region surveyed.

II. GENERAL WORKS

Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama. xxiii, 805 pp. (Columbia University Press, The Macmillan Company, agents: New York, 1905). Another edition (Arthur H. Clark Company: Cleveland, 1911).

This is one of the earlier and yet one of the most scholarly and scientific studies of reconstruction in the states. The author leaves hardly any field of human interest untouched. As a background he analyzes the social, political, and economic conditions of the state before the war, gives a succinct account of the part played by the great orator, William Lowndes Yancey, in the movement for secession, and explains why the nonslaveholding whites feared the free Negro and supported secession. The account of conditions during the war is accurate and fairly complete. The emphasis, however, is placed upon the Reconstruction period proper. No more thorough, scholarly, and impartial account has yet appeared. The author graphically portrays the social, political, religious, and economic effects of that terrible carnival of corruption upon the life and opinions of the mass of the people, and yet does it in a manner "practically free from partisan rancor."⁸⁰

"Deportation and Colonization: An Attempted Solution of the Race Problem," in *Studies in Southern History and Politics* inscribed to William Archibald Dunning (Columbia University Press: New York, 1914, viii, 394 pp.), 3-30.⁸¹

⁸⁰ See the reviews by David M. DeWitt in the *Political Science Quarterly*, XXI (1906), 535-39; by Scroggs in the *American Historical Review*, XI (1906), 943-44; and by David Y. Thomas in the *Southern History Association, Publications*, X (1906), 49-51.

⁸¹ See the review by Arthur C. Cole in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, III (1917), 108-12.

A reprint of *ibid.* 30 pp. (New York, 1914).

The Freedmen's Savings Bank: A Chapter in the Economic History of the Negro Race. x, 170 pp. (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1927).

This work is an expansion of the author's essay on "The Freedmen's Savings Bank" published in the *Yale Review* for 1906. It is a thoroughly adequate and interesting as well as suggestive study in the economic history of the Negro. The author's attitude toward Northern men and ideas is generous and toward the Negro sympathetic and fair; but he condemns in no uncertain terms the evils of a system which filched from the freedmen much of their savings, and also the corruption of Federal officials who were responsible for those robberies.⁸²

Louisiana State University, 1860-1896. x, 499 pp. (Louisiana State University Press: Baton Rouge, 1936).

This history ably supplements the earlier works of Professor Fleming on this subject. It was begun in 1909 at the request of the Alumni Association with the intention of bringing it out in 1910 as a part of the Semi-Centennial Celebration but the task was too large to be completed in such short order. The first eleven chapters were printed, but never bound, about twenty-five years ago. The remaining chapters were completed later and now appear in print for the first time. The author drew upon his rich background of Southern history and presents us a study not only rich for an understanding of Louisiana State University and of the state of Louisiana but of the whole problem of education during the trying ordeal of reconstruction. A foreword by Marcus M. Wilkerson tells the story of the writing of this valuable work in Southern educational history.

The Reconstruction of the Seceded States, 1865-1876. 163 pp. (New York State Education Department: Albany, 1905. Syllabus 98).

A comprehensive syllabus treatment of the Reconstruction period. The topical outline and reference make up 57 pages of the whole; illustrative original source materials constitute some 97 pages; the remainder is devoted to a bibliography of published writings on the period. Certainly the student "need have no murkiness of knowledge on that carnival of fanaticism" if he makes proper use of this guide. The references are of course now inadequate because of the great mass of writings on reconstruction since 1905.

The Sequel of Appomattox: A Chronicle of the Reunion of the States. ix, 322 pp. (Yale University Press: New Haven, 1919).

There are four editions of this work which is volume 32 of *The Chronicles of America Series*: the Abraham Lincoln Edition, 1919; the Graduates' Edi-

⁸² See the reviews by Thomas P. Abernethy in *ibid.*, XIV (1922), 559-60; and by Francis B. Simkins in the *North Carolina Historical Review*, V (1928), 458-59.

tion, 1920; the Roosevelt Edition, 1921; and the Textbook Edition, 1921. "One cannot well imagine a better nor a more interesting book on reconstruction than this, at least not within the limits of three hundred pages."⁸³ The selection of materials is excellent and the style gripping. The social organization of the South is admirably described and Carpetbag rule and the Ku Klux Klan are "marvels for just treatment and successful condensation." That he is partisan Professor Fleming never tried to conceal, but even so his account is so fair and honest that the book may be commended without reserve.⁸⁴

III. MONOGRAPHS, HISTORICAL ESSAYS, AND PERIODICAL ARTICLES

"The American Negro Academy," in the Southern History Association, *Publications*, IX (1905), 49-51.

"Blockade Running and Trade Through the Lines into Alabama, 1861-1865," in the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, IV (1905), 256-72.

"The Buford Expedition to Kansas," in the *American Historical Review*, VI (1901), 38-48.

"The Buford Expedition to Kansas," in the Alabama Historical Society, *Transactions*, IV (1904), 167-92.

A reprint of *ibid.* 25 pp. (Montgomery, 1904).

"The Buford Expedition to Kansas," 25 pp., in Alabama Polytechnic Institute, *Historical Papers*, first series (Montgomery, 1904).

"Changes in Property Values Since Reconstruction," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, VI (1909), 393-96.

"The Churches of Alabama During the Civil War and Reconstruction," in the *Gulf States Historical Magazine*, I (1902), 105-27.

A reprint of *ibid.* 25 pp. (W. M. Rogers and Company: Montgomery, 1902).

"Concerning Jefferson Davis," in the *Bookman*, LIX (1924), 82-85.

"Conscription and Exemption in Alabama During the Civil War," in the *Gulf States Historical Magazine*, II (1904), 310-25.

"The Economic Conditions During the Reconstruction," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, VI (1909), 1-11.

"The Economic Results of the Reconstruction," in *ibid.*, VI (1909), 12-16.

"The Effects of the Reconstruction on Property Values in the South," in *ibid.*, VI (1909), 390-93.

⁸³ See the review by William E. Dodd in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, VII (1921), 279.

⁸⁴ See *ibid.*, 279-81; and the review by Oberholtzer in the *American Historical Review*, XXV (1920), 519-20.

- "The Early Life of Jefferson Davis," in the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, *Proceedings*, 1915-1918, IX (1918), 151-76.
- "Ex-Slave Pension Frauds," in the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, IX (1910), 123-35.
- "The Formation of the Union League in Alabama," in the *Gulf States Historical Magazine*, II (1904), 73-89.
- A reprint of *ibid.* 18 pp. (Montgomery, 1903).
- "Forty Acres and a Mule," in the *North American*, CLXXXII (1906), 721-37.
- "The Freedmen's Savings Bank," a paper read before the American Historical Association at its annual meeting at Baltimore in 1905. Listed in the American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1905, I (Washington, 1906), 49.
- "The Freedmen's Savings Bank," in the *Yale Review*, XV (1906), 40-67, 134-46.
- A reprint of *ibid.* 41 pp. (New Haven, 1906).
- "Home Life in Alabama During the Civil War," in the Southern History Association, *Publications*, VIII (1904), 81-103.
- "Immigration and the Negro Problem," in the *World Today*, XII (1907), 96-97.
- "Immigration to the Southern States," in the *Political Science Quarterly*, XX (1905), 276-97.
- A reprint of *ibid.* 21 pp. (Ginn and Company: Boston, 1905).
- "The Independent Order of White Men," in the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, IV (1905), 78-81.
- "Industrial Development in Alabama During the Civil War," in *ibid.*, III (1904), 260-72.
- "Italian Farm Labor in the South," in the *World Today*, VII (1904), 1232-33.
- "Jefferson Davis at West Point," in the *Metropolitan*, XXVIII (1908), 277-90.
- "Jefferson Davis at West Point," in the Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications*, X (1909), 247-67.
- "Jefferson Davis' First Marriage," in *ibid.*, XII (1912), 21-36.
- "Jefferson Davis's Camel Experiment," in the *Popular Science Monthly*, LXXIV (1909), 141-52.
- "Jefferson Davis, The Negroes and the Negro Problem," in the *Sewanee Review*, XVI (1908), 407-27.
- "The Ku Klux Testimony Relating to Alabama," in the *Gulf States Historical Magazine*, II (1904), 155-60.
- A reprint of *ibid.* 6 pp. (Montgomery, 1903).
- "Labor and Labor Conditions," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, VI (1909), 41-48.

- "The Labor Force and Labor Conditions, 1861-1865," in *ibid.*, V (1909), 146-51.
- "Louisiana During the War Between the States and the Reconstruction, 1861-1877," in *ibid.*, III (1909), 134-62.
- "The Reconstruction, 1862-1877," in *ibid.*, IV (1909), 576-626.
- "Reconstruction in Alabama," in *ibid.*, II (1909), 293-311.
- "Letter to the *Montgomery Advertiser* on the Origin of the Ku Klux Klan," partially reprinted in the Mississippi Historical Society, *Publications*, IX (1906), 123-24.
- "The Memoirs of James Murray Mason, Confederate Commissioner to England," in the Southern History Association, *Publications*, VIII (1904), 465-72.
- "Military Government in Alabama, 1865-1866," in the *American Historical Magazine*, VIII (1903), 163-79.
- "Military Government in Alabama Under the Reconstruction Acts," in *ibid.*, VIII (1903), 222-52.
- "'Pap' Singleton, The Moses of the Colored Exodus," in the *American Journal of Sociology*, XV (1910), 61-82.
- "'Pap' Singleton, the Moses of the Colored Exodus," in *Americana (American Historical Magazine)*, VII (1912), 936-44.
- "The Peace Movement in Alabama During the Civil War. Part I, Party Politics, 1861-1864," in the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, II (1903), 114-24.
- "The Peace Movement in Alabama During the Civil War. Part II, The Peace Society, 1863-1865," in *ibid.*, II (1903), 246-60.
- "The Public Career of Robert Livingston," in the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, XXXII (1901), 129-35, 193-200.
- "The Religious and Hospitable Rite of Feet Washing," in the *Sewanee Review*, XVI (1908), 1-13.
- A reprint of *ibid.* 15 pp. (University of the South Press: Sewanee, 1908).
- "The Religious Life of Jefferson Davis," in the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, LIX (1910), 325-42.
- "Reorganization of the Industrial System in Alabama after the Civil War," in the *American Journal of Sociology*, X (1905), 473-99.
- "The Servant Problem in a Black Belt Village," in the *Sewanee Review*, XIII (1905), 1-17.
- "The Slave-Labor System in the Ante-Bellum South," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, V (1909), 104-20.
- "William Tecumseh Sherman as College President," in the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XI (1912), 33-54.

A reprint of *ibid.* 24 pp. (n. p., n. d.).

"William Tecumseh Sherman," in Francis Trevelyan Miller (ed.), *The Photographic History of the Civil War*, 10 vols. (Review of Reviews Company: New York, 1911), X, 75-97.

"W. T. Sherman as a History Teacher," in the *Educational Review*, XL (1910), 235-38.

IV. BULLETINS OF LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY⁸⁵

The Early Life of Jefferson Davis. 25 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1917), VIII, n. s., no. 6.

Ex-Slave Pension Frauds. 15 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1910), I, n. s., no. 9.

Jefferson Davis at West Point. 20 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1910), I, n. s., no. 3.

Jefferson Davis's Camel Experiment. 12 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1909), Ser. VII, no. 1, Pt. II.

Jefferson Davis, the Negroes and the Negro Problem. 23 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1908), Ser. VI, no. 4.

"Pap" Singleton, *the Moses of the Colored Exodus.* 22 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1909), Ser. VII, no. 3.

The Religious Life of Jefferson Davis. 20 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1910), I, n. s., no. 5.

William Tecumseh Sherman as College President. 24 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1912), III, n. s., no. 3, Pt. II.

W. T. Sherman as a History Teacher. 4 pp. (Baton Rouge, 1911), II, n. s., no. 10, Pt. II.

"College Entrance Requirements," in *Louisiana State University Quarterly* (Baton Rouge, 1912), VII, no. 1, pp. 23-42.

"Some Early Professors of the University," in *ibid.* (Baton Rouge, 1911), VI, no. 4, pp. 148-58.

"Raphael Semmes, Professor in Louisiana," in the *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, May 14, 1911.

V. CONTRIBUTIONS TO BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPEDIAS

A. *Dictionary of American Biography.* 20 vols. (Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1928-), edited by Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Professor W. H. Stephenson very kindly verified the Fleming writings in the Louisiana State University publications.

⁸⁶ Dr. Dumas Malone very kindly supplied me with the list of sketches written for the *Dictionary of American Biography* by Fleming.

- Barrow, Washington, I, 651 Brown, John Calvin, III, 135-36
 Bate, William Brimage, II, 42-43 Brown, Neill Smith, III, 147-48
 Baxter, John, II, 63 Carmack, Edward Ward, III, 496-97
- B. *The Encyclopedia Americana*. 30 vols. (The Encyclopedia Americana Corporation: New York, 1924).
- Buchanan, James, IV, 659-61 Stephens, Alexander Hamilton, XXV, 618-20
 New Orleans, Louisiana, XX, 153-58 Suffrage, XXVII, 466-68
 Randolph, John, XXIII, 209 Taney, Roger Brooke, XXVI, 240-41
 Sheridan, Philip Henry, XXV, 701-702 Toombs, Robert, XXVI, 697-98
- C. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Eleventh Edition, 29 vols. (The University Press: Cambridge, 1911).
- Freedmen's Bureau, XI, 75 McGillivray, Alexander, XVII, 231
 Knights of the Golden Circle, XV, 868 Nullification, XIX, 846
 Ku Klux Klan, XV, 942-43 Secession, XXIV, 568-69
 Lynch Law, XVII, 169-70 The Union League of America, XXVII, 593
- D. *Ibid.*, Fourteenth Edition. 24 vols. (The Encyclopaedia Company, Ltd.: London, 1929).
- Lynch Law, XIV, 526 Secession, XX, 256
 Nullification, XVI, 595
- E. *Cyclopedia of American Government*. 3 vols. (D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1914), edited by Andrew C. McLaughlin and Albert Bushnell Hart.
- Ku Klux Klan, II, 282-83 Louisiana, II, 374-76
- F. *Nelson's Perpetual Loose Leaf Encyclopaedia*. 12 vols. (Thomas Nelson and Sons: New York, 1905-1930), edited by John H. Finley.⁸⁷
- Secession, XI, 79-80 State Rights, XII, 411-11A
- G. Section Six, Biography, Vols. XI and XII, in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, 12 vols. (The Southern Historical Publication Society: Richmond, 1909), edited by J. A. C. Chandler *et al.*
- Audubon, John James, XI, 28-30 Brownlow, William Gannaway, XI, 132-33
 Benton, Thomas Hart, XI, 72-74 Byrd, William, XI, 149-50
 Boone, Daniel, XI, 100-102

⁸⁷ Mr. Henri F. Klein, Office Editor, very kindly verified the Fleming essays in *Nelson's Encyclopaedia*.

- Campbell, Alexander, XI, 167-68
 Clark, George Rogers, XI, 202-203
 Clay, Cassius Marcellus, XI, 205-206
 Crockett, David, XI, 241-42
 Davis, Jefferson, XI, 260-65
 DeBow, James Dunwoody Brownson, XI, 272-73
 Duke, Basil W., XI, 303
 Eggleston, George Cary, XI, 314-15
 Evans, Clement Anseim, XI, 325-26
 Farragut, David Glasgow, XI, 336-37
 Folk, Joseph Wingate, XI, 353
 Grady, Henry Woodfin, XI, 418-19
 Harben, William Nathaniel, XI, 440-41
 Harper, Robert Goodloe, XI, 447-48
 Hoge, Moses Drury, XI, 501-502
 Johnson, Andrew, XI, 567-71
 Johnson, Richard Malcolm, XII, 14
 LeConte, Joseph, XII, 64-66
 Lincoln, Abraham, XII, 97-102
 Livingston, Edward, XII, 105-106
 Marshall, John, XII, 163-66
 Mason, George, XII, 169-70
 Sevier, John, XII, 382-84
 Stephens, Alexander Hamilton, XII, 419-21
 Toombs, Robert Augustus, XII, 463-65
 Wirt, William, XII, 567-70

VI. BOOK REVIEWS

A. *American Historical Review*

- J. G. de R. Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina* (Edwards and Broughton: Raleigh, 1906), XII (1907), 911-12.
 Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer, *A History of the United States Since the Civil War*, III (The Macmillan Company: New York, 1926), XXXIII (1928), 162-64.

B. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*

- Thomas Perkins Abernethy, *The Formative Period in Alabama, 1815-1828* (Alabama Department of Archives and History: Montgomery, 1922), XI (1923), 586-87.
 Charles Francis Adams, *Trans-Atlantic Historical Solidarity. Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford in Easter and Trinity Terms, 1913* (The Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1913), I (1915), 109-10.
 Thomas Jackson Arnold, *Early Life and Letters of General Thomas J. Jackson ("Stonewall Jackson")* (Fleming H. Revell Company: New York, 1916), IV (1918), 511-13.
 Emma Jerome Blackwood (ed.), *To Mexico With Scott: Letters of Captain E. Kirby Smith to his Wife* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1917), IV (1918), 539-40.

- Douglas S. Freeman, *Lee's Dispatches. Unpublished Letters of General Robert E. Lee, C.S.A. to Jefferson Davis and the war department of the Confederate States of America* (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1915), III (1917), 540-42.
- Peter J. Hamilton, *Mobile of Five Flags. The Story of the River Basin and Coast about Mobile from the Earliest Times to the Present* (The Gill Printing Company: Mobile, 1913), I (1915), 319-20.
- David Starr Jordan and Harvey Ernest Jordan, *War's Aftermath. A preliminary study of the eugenics of war as illustrated by the Civil War of the United States and the late wars in the Balkans* (Houghton Mifflin Company: New York, 1914), II (1916), 429-30.
- Edgar W. Knight, *The Influence of Reconstruction on Education in the South* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1913), I (1915), 595-97.
- George Haven Putnam, *Memories of My Youth, 1844-1865* (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1914), II (1916), 144-45.
- C. V. Roman, *American Civilization and the Negro. The Afro-American in Relation to National Progress* (F. A. Davis Company: Philadelphia, 1916), III (1917), 528-30.
- Frederick W. Seward, *Reminiscences of a War-Time Statesman and Diplomat, 1830-1915* (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1916), IV (1918), 255.
- Stephen B. Weeks, *History of Public School Education in Alabama* (Government Printing Office: Washington, 1915), and *History of Public School Education in Arkansas* (Government Printing Office: Washington, 1912), III (1917), 116-17.
- Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861. A History of the education of the colored people of the United States from the beginning of slavery to the Civil War* (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1915), II (1916), 586-89.
- C. *Political Science Quarterly*
- Winfield H. Collins, *The Domestic Slave Trade of the Southern States* (Broadway Publishing Company: New York, 1904), XXI (1906), 539-40.
- W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, (ed.), *The Negro Church. A Social Study. Made under the direction of Atlanta University by the Atlanta Conference* (Atlanta University Press: Atlanta, 1903), XIX (1904), 702-703.
- Hamilton J. Eckenrode, *The Political History of Virginia During the Reconstruction* (The Johns Hopkins Press: Baltimore, 1904), XX (1905), 319-21.

George S. Merriam, *The Negro and the Nation: A History of American Slavery and Emancipation* (Henry Holt and Company: New York, 1906), XXI (1906), 703-706.

Edgar G. Murphy, *Problems of the Present South. A Discussion of certain of the Educational, Industrial, and Political Issues of the Southern States* (The Macmillan Company: New York, 1904), XX (1905), 161-63.

James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, V (The Macmillan Company: New York, 1904), XX (1905), 535-39.

William A. Sinclair, *The Aftermath of Slavery. A Study of the Condition and Environment of the American Negro* (Small, Maynard and Company: Boston, 1905), XXI (1906), 344-45.

D. *Publications of the Southern History Association*

Augustus C. Buell, *History of Andrew Jackson. Pioneer, Patriot, Soldier, Politician, President*. 2 vols. (Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1904), IX (1905), 132-33.

Harriet C. Cooper, *James Oglethorpe. The Founder of Georgia* (D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1904), VIII (1904), 238-39.

J. Hector St. John Crèvecoeur, *Letters from an American Farmer* (Fox, Duffield and Company: New York, 1904), IX (1905), 133-35.

James Wilford Garner, *Reconstruction in Mississippi* (The Macmillan Company: New York, 1901), VI (1902), 171-73.

Captain Robert E. Lee, *Recollections and Letters of General Robert E. Lee* (Doubleday, Page and Company: New York, 1904), IX (1905), 245-47.

Susan Dabney Smedes, *A Southern Planter. Social Life in the Old South* (James Pott and Company: New York, 1900), VIII (1904), 404-405.

Ada Sterling (ed.), *A Belle of the Fifties. Memoirs of Mrs. Clay of Alabama, Covering Social and Political Life in Washington and the South* (Doubleday, Page and Company: New York, 1904), IX (1905), 54-55.

Waddy Thompson, *A History of the United States* (D. C. Heath and Company: Boston, 1904), VIII (1904), 479-80.

Thomas E. Watson, *The Life and Times of Thomas Jefferson* (D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1903), VIII (1904), 391-93.

The list of Fleming's writings as compiled above is a tribute to his industry and indefatigable labors. The remarkable thing about his works is the unity of their subject matter. With the exception of a

few minor articles contributed to encyclopedias, all of them center around the Civil War and Reconstruction and are encompassed by a span of twenty-five years. Another notable thing about them is that with one or two exceptions all were written in the twenty-five years between 1903 and 1928. One might think that Dr. Fleming would have been content to rest on his laurels. But not so. When cut down by the grim reaper, he had several other works projected. Among them were a history of the sugar industry of the ante-bellum South, a history of the Ku Klux Klan and related secret organizations, and a life of Jefferson Davis. The vast amount of material collected on the career of Davis was placed at the disposal of Dr. Robert M. McElroy, Professor of American history in Queen's College, Oxford, who is engaged in writing a life of the Confederate president. The Davis material, after Dr. McElroy finishes with it, together with the data on the Ku Klux Klan and other historical subjects, is to be deposited in the New York Public Library where it is to be accessible to students of American history.⁸⁸ Southern historiography has lost immeasurably in that these works were not finished. Dr. Fleming might have and no doubt would have written definitive works on both the Klan and Jefferson Davis. But without these projected works, no other one man has contributed so much to the understanding of the period as Walter Lynwood Fleming and he stands out as *The Historian of Reconstruction*.

⁸⁸ Information supplied by Mrs. Fleming.

Book Reviews

Humor of the Old Deep South. Edited by Arthur Palmer Hudson. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1936. Pp. xxiv, 548. \$5.00.)

Although Southern humor has not been as badly neglected as Mr. H. L. Mencken has indicated, none of the writers dealing with the subject has turned away from the beaten path in search of new materials. *Humor of the Old Deep South* does not follow the lead of Longstreet, Baldwin, Watterson, and Meine, but utilizes the less obvious humorous writings of the South. Geographically Professor Hudson has carved out a territory to his own liking. It includes parts of Alabama, Louisiana, Tennessee, and all of Mississippi, and to this region he has given the composite title Missloulala. Missloulala was once a rugged and wild territory in which its people lived lives "with the bark on them."

Even before the white man braved the attacks of mosquitoes, chiggers, and savage Indians to make a permanent settlement in this Southern territory, he was cutting antics with the dusky inhabitants of the forest. Spanish grandees and French adventurers were actively making love to unsuspecting forest maidens. De Soto, so Rangel says, did excellent work for the Faith and the Cross, but he thinks in all fairness that he should have told Chief Casqui that he was married. Perhaps De Soto the diplomat, or De Soto the sportsman, was far too tactful to refuse Casqui's generous gift of a daughter. In the chronicles of other territorial escapades, Professor Hudson was able to find much material of human interest.

Most of the material pertaining to the period before 1800 serves as a prologue to white settlement of Missloulala. It was not until after this date that the white population increased sufficiently to supply local society with such professional men as "ba'r" hunters; doctors; politicians; lawyers, judges, and catchpoles; preachers; players and showmen; barkeepers and bonifaces; broad-horn boys and steamboat bullies; captains, colonels, and privates; pirates and picaroons; schoolmasters and collegians; duelists; ha'nts; and greenhorns. When these professions were represented in the Old Deep South life became highly interesting. Here the author had "fat pickings." From the pages of travel books, contemporary newspapers, territorial archives, personal reminiscences, and Porter's *New York Spirit of the Times* many hilarious tales of "big doings" have been brought to light.

The author showed excellent taste by not overworking Mike Fink, John A.

Murrell, and other notorious Southwesterners. He lets Mike Fink ride Deacon Smith's bull and go. Professor Hudson does, however, devote considerable space to the escapades of a South Carolina Gil Blas named David Theodore Hines. Hines was a discriminating desperado. Although he was in personal contact with Murrell, the South Carolinian detested Murrell's technique. Hines lived to commit bloodier deeds than did most of his contemporary bandits of the old Natchez Trace. Even the dignified calfbound *Acts* of the Southern general assemblies yielded nuggets of legislative wit for this volume. For instance, the printer for the Mississippi legislature created a baffling situation for the conscientious commissioners of the public landing at Joburg, Mississippi. By a humorous slip of the printer's proof an otherwise serious act was caused to read, "It shall be the duty of the board of police, to appoint three commissioners, disinterred." Ordinarily this shortcoming of the printer's art would have been overlooked, but not so at Joburg where there resided an ardent disciple of strict legal construction. Again Professor Hudson found the legislative fathers of Louisiana a bit confused when a bill was pending before the legislature to protect "chaste" women. This confusion was satisfactorily disposed of when a member, well endowed with mother wit, proposed, "Mister Speaker, I move to mend this secshun by inserting the words, 'an cotched,' after the word 'chased.'" The Congressional *Globe* and *Record* were sources for many choice bits of humor. Chief among the congressional wits were Private John Allen and John Sharp Williams.

Professor Hudson has chosen his selections wisely. Obviously there are scores of prime Southern stories which had to be omitted for lack of space. However, Missloulala's humor has been adequately represented in this book. None of the earlier collections of Southern humor have gone so carefully into the subject. Other compilations have been concerned principally with the subject as it followed a hard and fast pattern. *Humor of the Old Deep South* presents a minimum amount of custom-made material, but holds more closely to that humor which was of spontaneous origin. Professor Hudson has made a worthy and entertaining contribution to the literature of the South.

University of Kentucky

T. D. CLARK

Universal Education in the South. By Charles William Dabney. Volume I. *From the Beginning to 1900.* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936. Pp. xvi, 568. Illustrations, appendixes. \$3.75.)

To write the history of *Universal Education in the South*, in two volumes, is an exceedingly difficult task; considering the limitations of space this author has done, in the main, a good piece of work. Volume I which brings the story down to 1900 is of unequal merit. The first part (chapters I to VI) is exceptionally well done; in it we have an analysis of Jefferson's plan for public

schools in Virginia which is very carefully related to Jefferson's political philosophy. He calls attention to the fact that Jefferson was the first one to outline a system of public education as a function of the state.

The author explains the origin of Jefferson's concept of education and shows that even though the Virginian knew of Plato's idea of educating men for the service of the state and of the demands of Protestant reformers for universal education, the plan for a complete system of public schools, supported by taxation, was original with Jefferson. We learn that Jefferson's ideas on education were a hundred years ahead of his time; and, because of his opposition to centralization of government, his plan was not adopted; and that "the southern colonists were not prepared in 1779 to carry on a democracy such as Jefferson conceived. Slavery had first to be abolished and the people to be freed from a feudal system."

The conditioning factors which stood in the way of establishing public schools in the South are considered. The Southern colonists were interested in education and schools were established at an early period. The author alludes to the gift to the London Company in 1619 for the establishment of a free school for the teaching of "a convenient number of Indian children from the ages of seven to twelve in the art of reading and in the principles of Christian religion," and to the first free school for white children in the colonies, established in 1620 at Charles City in Virginia, and to "the first effective free school in America" established in Virginia on the foundation left by Benjamin Symms in his will, bearing the date 1634. These early efforts were of interest but did not develop on any large scale so that "the struggle for universal education in Virginia" really began with the Declaration of Independence.

The author then presents the founding of academies which became important throughout the South. He discusses David Caldwell's log college and tells the interesting story of Zion-Parnassus, a school established by Samuel McCorkle, which was very influential and became important as a training center for teachers and which is quite rightly alluded to "as the first normal school in America."

In chapter VII we find a very good description of conditions at the close of the War between the North and the South and of the great need for education. At this critical period George Peabody came forward and became "the first of the line of philanthropists to aid the southern states in their struggle for education after the Civil War." In a very able way the author discusses the establishment of the Peabody Fund and the leaders who were associated with its administration. He discusses the work of Dr. Barnas Sears and Dr. J. L. M. Curry in promoting teacher training through institutes and normal schools. One finds no reference, however, to Eben Stearns, president of Peabody College from 1875 to 1887. William Harold Payne, president of that institution from 1887 to 1902, is also overlooked even though he was one of the most famous educational leaders in the country and the first in the United States to hold the

title, professor of education. The author has overlooked a study of George Poret, entitled *Educational Contributions of William Harold Payne*, published in 1930.

Chapters VIII to XIX inclusive each treat of the schools of one of the Southern states to 1900. These accounts must necessarily be brief, and one gets the impression that some of them are rather too sketchy. In the chapter on "Schools of Tennessee to 1900," for example, one finds no mention of John Berrien Lindsley, president of the University of Nashville from 1855 to 1870, who was an ardent advocate of public education and emphasized teacher training. In the chapter on "The Schools of Kentucky to 1900," one finds no reference to the excellent study of T. E. Smith, *The Rise of Teacher Training in Kentucky*, published in 1932. One can easily understand the limitations which are placed on the author who attempts to cover so wide a field in two volumes. In spite of these shortcomings he has produced a valuable study and brings to our attention a field much neglected by historians.

Peabody College

FREMONT P. WIRTH

History of Wake Forest College. Volume I, 1834-1865. By George Washington Paschal. (Wake Forest, North Carolina: Wake Forest College, 1935. Pp. viii, 684. Illustrations. \$2.00.)

After a sufficient measure of unity had been attained among General, Particular, and Separate Baptists of North Carolina to permit the organization of a state convention (1830) the first steps were soon taken toward the training of "a better educated ministry," a service which the members of the denomination felt could not be performed by the state university (opened in 1795) where they believed a contempt for religion, general slackness in student morals, and an aristocratic Federalist tradition prevailed. In 1832 a farm was purchased in Wake County some fifteen miles from the town of Raleigh; on December 21 of the next year a charter was secured in spite of strong opposition in the legislature; and on February 3, 1834, Wake Forest Institute was opened to students. The manual training system, which had been adopted in the beginning, having disappointed the hopes of many patrons that it would promote a scientific knowledge of agriculture was abandoned at the end of the fifth year. On December 28, 1838, the charter was amended, and on the following February 2 the institution commenced operations under the name of Wake Forest College. The college thus established is the second oldest among the institutions of higher learning of North Carolina, its organization as an institute having preceded the founding of Davidson College by several years and its amended charter having antedated that of the other school by a matter of a few hours.

The experience of the Institute indicated that the patronage of a fair number of students could be expected. The College possessed what was considered the best building of its kind in the state, but the trustees found themselves in 1839

with a debt of \$20,000. To lift this burden and to accumulate an adequate endowment fund were their chief concerns during the next twenty years. The crisis in the financial affairs of the College was temporarily met two years later with a loan of \$10,000 from the state. Thereafter the agents of the institution, especially Washington Manly Wingate who later became president of the faculty, were more successful in their appeals for contributions. In addition the trustees derived a small revenue from the sale of a part of their lands, the nucleus of the future town of Wake Forest. The result was that when the College was forced to suspend its exercises in the second year of the Confederate War it was free from debt, had an endowment of something over \$50,000, and was possessed of property valued at an equal amount.

The student body was never large, averaging about ninety in the College and the preparatory department combined. The number of matriculates during the ante-bellum period was 1087. But the founders and supporters of the College had cause for satisfaction with their achievement. The course of study, though somewhat deficient in the natural sciences, suffers nothing by comparison with those of other American colleges of the period. Under the stimulus of the College, many Baptist associations in the state established secondary schools. Special recompense was found in the number of students who entered the ministry (more than one hundred) and the other professions and in the general religious atmosphere which prevailed in the institution. Periodical revivals swept through the student body like a "mighty rushing wind" bringing conviction to Samuel Wait, first president of the faculty and later for many years president of the trustees, that "the seal of the Lord's approval" was on the College. On their own volition the student literary societies purged their libraries of such books as Thomas Paine's *Theological Works* and the *Decameron*.

Professor Paschal has told the story of Wake Forest from the establishment of the Institute to the suspension of the exercises of the College in 1862 and has given the records of trustees, faculty, and alumni in peace and in war with meticulous attention to detail. The reader will marvel that the records of a Southern institution have survived in sufficient quantity to permit the writing of so complete a history. But such records there are for Wake Forest—official records of the institution, student reminiscences, and apparently innumerable notices and editorial comments in the Baptist periodicals of the state. These, scanned by the author with amazing industry, have made it possible for him to obey the injunction of Dr. R. D. W. Connor, at the commencement of the work, that he "put in everything." The general reader will be impatient with the multitudinous details and frequent repetitions; the unorthodox may fail to see the many interpositions of Providence which were revealed to the author; but the alumnus, for whom undoubtedly the book is principally intended, and the social historian will be grateful.

The Story of the Citadel. By Colonel O. J. Bond. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, 1936. Pp. ix, 242. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

The Story of the Citadel, written by Colonel O. J. Bond and published posthumously by Mrs. Bond, gives an intimate account of the founding, development, and firm establishment of the military college of South Carolina. The Citadel like Virginia Military Institute took West Point as a model.

This college, founded in 1842, has a unique place in the history of South Carolina and in the development of Charleston, its romantic chief city. In 1822 a slave revolt was planned by Denmark Vesey, a free man of color, but proved abortive when detected by the whites. Out of this incident grew the "fortified arsenal," later called the Citadel, for the protection of the people of Charleston. In the early thirties antinational sentiment grew rapidly in South Carolina as a result of tariff controversies. With the passage of the Ordinance of Nullification in 1832, Federal troops were removed from the Citadel by request of local authorities. State soldiers promptly occupied the barracks.

In 1833, after the nullification issue was settled, the legislature passed an act establishing two arsenals, one at Charleston and the other at Columbia. From 1838, and especially after 1842 when they were recognized as two parts of an academy, until Sherman burned Columbia in 1865 the two institutions were united in training the youth of South Carolina. The cadets spent the first year at Columbia and the last years at Charleston.

The book is organized into two parts with the reopening of the Citadel in 1882 as the dividing line. Between 1865 and 1879 the barracks were occupied by Federal troops, so during that time the institution did not function as a college. After 1869 numerous requests were made for the return of the property to the state but these were denied for over a decade. After the removal of Federal troops there began a difficult struggle to secure restitution for losses suffered by the buildings during occupation and for rental payments.

The life of the Citadel until recent years has always been a struggle against great odds. In the early days small appropriations from the state and limited fees handicapped the work. Next the war took its toll of graduates, teachers, and students and left the campus bereft of its life. Reconstruction found the buildings in the hands of Federal authorities. After it was reopened the state was too poor to operate it in a manner befitting its history. Growth in the succeeding years was slight.

The World War and the recognition of the value of collegiate military training gave new life to the Citadel. Now secure in its future by virtue of state and Federal support, it looks forward to years of growth. In the 1920's the College moved to a new location in the city where it has adequate room for expansion.

The story of the Citadel is told in an interesting fashion, and will doubtless please its readers because of the writer's stock of intimate knowledge and his familiarity with its traditions as well as its history. Colonel Bond spent fifty

years as student, professor, and superintendent on the campus. He was doubtless better qualified than any other man to tell its story. Many readers will be surprised at the rigor of the training even at the beginning of its history; the iron discipline which even caused the loss of one graduating class; the length of the sessions; the extent of the summer marches into the upper part of the state; and, most unusual of all, the fact that commencement exercises were held no less than ten times outside of Charleston, once in Norfolk, Virginia.

In reading the story of the Citadel one is impressed with the contribution of such sterling leaders as Colonels Thomas, Coward, and Bond, to mention only a few. One is also impressed with the devotion of the graduates of that famous institution. This, too, has had much to do with keeping the life blood running strongly.

Converse College

RICHARD GABRIEL STONE

Early Explorations and Mission Establishments in Texas. By Edward W. Heusinger. (San Antonio: The Naylor Company, 1936. Pp. xvi, 222. Bibliography, maps, frontispiece. \$2.50.)

The Texas Centennial has been the occasion for the publication of numerous books and pamphlets on various phases dealing with the history of the state. *Early Explorations and Mission Establishments in Texas* is just another of these books that attempts to present the connected narrative of the missions in Texas from the earliest days to the time of their extinction. The author frankly admits that the book is based on notes made between 1906 and 1915. Little wonder that there is nothing new in the book. The enormous amount of research done in the field of Texas history since 1915 is completely ignored. The result is that the traditional errors are repeated in the present narrative and the book could have been published twenty-one years ago. The author does not seem to be familiar with Spanish spelling or Spanish usage. He often uses the title *Don* without a surname, as *Don Espejo*, a thing never done in Spanish. Such usage is a reflection on the character of the man to whom it is applied. Other errors of a similar nature are the use of *Fontecuberta* for *Fontcuberta*, *Conchas* for *Conchos*, *Verona* for *Varona*, *Cavillo* for *Caballo*, and others too numerous to mention.

But the unpardonable mistake of the author is his confusion of the Presidio Chapel of La Bahía with the mission site of Nuestra Señora del Espíritu Santo de Zúñiga. There is no excuse for such an error, even granting that no works since 1915 were consulted by the author. The bibliography both of manuscripts and books includes numerous items which are not cited anywhere in the text. On the whole *Early Explorations and Mission Establishments in Texas* is a readable, popular summary of the traditional history of the Texas missions, marred by numerous inaccuracies and misspellings. There is little excuse for bringing out such a compilation entirely out of date at this time.

University of Texas

C. E. CASTAÑEDA

The British Empire before the American Revolution: Provincial Characteristics and Sectional Tendencies in the Era Preceding the American Crisis. By Lawrence Henry Gipson. Three volumes. (Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1936. Pp. xxix, 301; xxx, 383; xxxvi, 247. Maps. \$15.00.)

Professor Gipson is convinced that a detailed study of the last quarter century of the old British Empire will place the American Revolution in its proper light. The American Colonial crisis will be interpreted in its imperial setting. The present volumes depict the civilization of the Empire in its economic, social, and political aspects on the eve of the French and Indian War. The author stresses the interrelation of economic activity of the different sections. Subtitles of the volumes are: Volume I, *Great Britain and Ireland*; Volume II, *The Southern Plantations*; Volume III, *The Northern Plantations*. In all, ten or more volumes will be required to complete this work. One volume will be a critical discussion of source material. Research has been carried on in the archives and libraries of the British Isles and North America, and the harvest has been worth the effort. The location of manuscript material is indicated. Maps, many being reproductions of contemporary charts, illustrate each volume.

In his account of England the author describes the influence of the mercantile and industrial leaders on national polity; the favorable balance of trade; and the excellence of its government in preserving civil liberty. He emphasizes the economic well-being and the seemly deportment of the common people. This is opposite to the contentions of some historians who would have us believe that the people of England were degraded on the eve of the industrial revolution. The merchants of Glasgow dominated the tobacco trade. The government brought law and order to the Highlands; the clans henceforth were loyal to the Hanoverian line. Nor were opportunities for economic advancement wanting in Ireland. The Irish woollen industry was prosperous; England encouraged the linen and provision industries; but the people were not inclined to work. The author's contention that the Ulster Scot migration to America was a phase of the border Scottish Odyssey from the Highlands of Scotland to the last American frontier might well have received more extensive exposition.

Three outstanding features of the third volume are a masterly discussion of the British and Colonial iron industry; the summarization of the characteristics and tendencies of the Empire; and the rehabilitation of the character of Thomas Penn. All previous estimates of him have been based on the testimony of his enemies. They charged that he was avaricious, dishonest, and unprincipled. That he was close in business matters is true, but the debts which William Penn left the family made it necessary for him to give strict attention to the management of the propriety. A man of good character and an excellent proprietor, he gave to the province of Pennsylvania a businesslike administration, putting an end to a world of confusion—something which William Penn could not do. There are also chapters on the Newfoundland fisheries and the Hudson Bay Company.

Tidewater and frontier, with their varied economic, social, political, and religious problems and animosities, and the economy of the production of staple crops by slave labor, whether on the Continent or in the West Indies, form the subjects treated in the volume on the Southern colonies. Factors in the production of staple crops, and the comparative advantages and disadvantages of the producers of tobacco, rice, indigo, and sugar are considered in relation to the permanence of the labor supply and the need for annual importation of slaves; the amount of skill required in the production of various staples; the quality of the soil, its exhaustion, and the competition of fresh lands; the food supply; the cost of equipment to operate a plantation; the security or insecurity of markets and the trend of prices; and the rôle of taxation—all factors which would affect production and profits. To illustrate, the tobacco planter ultimately found that his labor force tended to become self-perpetuating; the sugar planter needed yearly importations of slaves from Africa to maintain his force; but both were handicapped by the heavy burden of taxes and duties and by the competition of fresh lands, in the Piedmont for one and in the French West Indies for the other. All factors considered, the rice planter enjoyed decided advantages, and his prosperity made possible the brilliant society of eighteenth century Charleston.

Not all plantation labor was performed by slaves. In fact, the poorer planters of Maryland preferred indentured convict labor. These convicts were bound for at least seven years—the period of the economic life of a slave in the West Indies—and were secured for costs slightly above the expenses of transportation. At a fraction of the cost which the sugar planter paid, the poorer planter of Maryland secured acceptable labor for the same term of years. A concluding chapter treats of the slave trade, and indicates how dependent was the prosperity of Britain, the East India Company, the provision and plantation colonies on the traffic in Negroes.

The tobacco planter charged that the merchants of Great Britain entered into a conspiracy to fix the price of his product. Professor Gipson exonerates the merchants, and his evidence is convincing. Competition between various mercantile houses and the rivalry of various ports was so keen as to preclude the possibility of an agreement on the price of tobacco. Furthermore, the risks were great and the profits small as the numerous failures of merchants testify, a condition which indicates that the tobacco trade was perhaps as unsatisfactory to the merchants as to the planters. The competition of fresh lands with the consequent surplus of tobacco and the crushing weight of imposts levied by Parliament were the chief factors in setting the low and unremunerative price of tobacco. Thus the imperial approach to a problem of Colonial economic life has provided a solution of a much argued and vexatious question.

Professor Gipson has produced an excellent and readable history; his discus-

sion of the civilization of the Empire is scholarly and often presents new points of view. His fundamental thesis—to survey the critical years, 1750-1776, from the standpoint of the Empire—is sound.

Smithshire, Illinois

CHARLES F. STRONG

The Stranger in America, 1793-1806. Reprinted from the London edition of 1807. By Charles William Janson, with an introduction and notes by Carl S. Driver. (New York: Press of the Pioneers, Inc., 1935. Pp. xxix, 502. Illustrations, appendix. \$5.00.)

This is a limited, autographed edition of an old travel account, first published in London in 1807. The editor has done his work carefully. An introduction gives the necessary information regarding the author and the book, and quotes contemporary English reviewers, most of them unfavorable, as to its value. Numerous notes by the editor identify places and names and correct the author's many slips, and a good index adds greatly. The press work, however, falls far short of the standard set by the editor. The printing is definitely bad, especially in the opening pages, the original illustrations, excellent in themselves, are carelessly placed on the pages, and the binding is poor. The late Dr. Driver's many friends will treasure this book as a fine example of his own work, but will always regret that the publishers did so poor a job of an expensive edition.

The account is not the usual travel diary, for the author, Charles William Janson, lived in the United States for over a decade after 1793 and was engaged in speculative enterprises much of the time. As a result he learned a great deal more than the casual visitor, and his book is a series of isolated sketches on such widely separated topics as the history of Whalley and Goffe—the regicides sheltered by Massachusetts Bay, American drama, the characters of certain American leaders, and incidents of the Revolution. There are also, of course, the usual accounts of customs and manners, North and South, descriptions of curiosities, native birds and animals, natural resources, and the like, and complaints of the terrible trials of traveling in America. On some of these subjects, as Dr. Driver says in the introduction, Janson possessed really detailed and accurate information; on others, however, he carelessly reflected inaccurate rumor and gossip. Indeed, there is so much of it that one is inclined to paraphrase his own words, "He was a stranger, and they took him in."

There is definite value here for the modern reader, in spite of the book's obvious faults, well pointed out both by the editor and the contemporary reviewers. Although Dr. Driver says in one place that the final pronouncement on its value was made by one of these reviewers—"Janson, author of *The Stranger in America*, it is there said, came and returned a stranger," yet elsewhere he himself makes the really final pronouncement: "Its principal value to the modern reader may be found in its rather faithful and authentic characterizations of the average citizen of the United States."

Agnes Scott College

PHILIP DAVIDSON

The Story of the West Florida Rebellion. By Stanley Clisby Arthur. (St. Francisville, Louisiana: The Democrat, 1935. Pp. 164.)

This brochure is a combination of newspaper articles designed to illustrate and popularize local history in that portion of Louisiana known as "The Florida Parishes." The attempt is a worthy one, the execution far from satisfactory. The author claims to have used original materials gathered as a result of extensive search among family collections, state and parish archives, and national and foreign repositories. A few notes at the end of the monograph make some reference to these sources, but the body of the text shows that he has in general followed previous writers in the field without contributing materially to our knowledge of the region. In his introduction he touches briefly on events before 1803 and gives a few new details about communities in the "Feliciana" district. He then plunges into the story of the revolt of 1810 without making any adequate summary of the interesting events that preceded that outbreak, although he does quote extensively from New Orleans papers and from documents that throw some light on these events. For the revolt itself, he seems to paraphrase the reviewer's *West Florida Controversy* without, however, giving credit to this and other monographs in the field. He has brought together a considerable amount of material that should arouse local interest and lead to a more careful study of early historical materials still to be found in Baton Rouge and vicinity. If his references to numerous family names of the early period lead to a more careful search for manuscript collections among their descendants, the work will have been worthwhile. In itself, the monograph adds little to the information already supplied by the West Florida Papers in the Library of Congress and the collections of the Archives of the Indies at Seville.

Northwestern University

I. J. Cox

The Living Jefferson. By James Truslow Adams. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936. Pp. vii, 403. \$3.00.)

The Jeffersonian Tradition in American Democracy. By Charles Maurice Wiltse. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935. Pp. xii, 273. \$3.00.)

Each of these volumes attempts to bring Jefferson down to date. Neither is a biography. Since there seems to be more than one living Jefferson and more than one Jeffersonian tradition, it is evident that one author believed that he was presenting the "true" living Jefferson, the other that he was setting out the "true" Jeffersonian tradition. The groups, strongly claiming that Jefferson, if here, would support their theories and programs, are so divergent that the great democrat himself would be surprised were he to return to earth and learn what policies he would positively uphold and what men would certainly be of his inner circle.

In *The Living Jefferson*, Mr. Adams declares at the start that Jefferson "kept his feet on the ground," and further that "he not only believed but said over and over that government and institutions had to be suited to a people of any given time and place, and could not be true or good everywhere and always." Tracing his career, as he passed through many years of public life, Mr. Adams frequently notes that the necessity of adaptation of government to changing conditions was an accepted part of the creed of Jefferson. However, since the all important thing "was his consistent and never changing devotion to liberal ideals, to freedom of speech, thought, action, press, and religion," Mr. Adams concludes that the Sage of Monticello, if among us today, would stand against the New Deal administration of President Roosevelt. Anyone familiar with Jefferson's words and actions will agree that he was first, last, and always the champion of the rights and privileges of common men, but there will be widespread dissent from the contention that the Roosevelt regime is antagonistic to the fundamental ideals that were dear to the heart of the Virginia statesman.

The Jefferson Tradition has less to do with the events and movements of American history. The author adheres closely to his task of analyzing and interpreting the principles of Jefferson. The volume shows patient and careful study of the sources, and the quoted passages throughout the book are extremely well chosen. After a study of Jefferson's writings in relation to government, law, and society, Mr. Wiltse declares that "The political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson rests on two basic assumptions, both of which are ethical: that the end of life is individual happiness, and that the purpose of the state is to secure and increase that happiness." He finds that "Jefferson realized the futility of trying to fix in one generation political forms that should be valid for all time." The legacy of the great man, then, is "not his solution of the political problem, but his realization that the problem must be solved anew in each succeeding generation." This being true, "Our heritage is his faith that an informed and intelligent people can and will work out their own salvation."

The author sees his way around what has been to many a major difficulty in Jeffersonian doctrine. "In affirming the best government to be that which governs the least, Jefferson proclaims himself an individualist and commits himself to an economic theory of laissez faire; but," continues Mr. Wiltse, "he declares also that the welfare of the whole is the proper purpose of the state, and maintains the power of the government to curtail the activities of the individual for the common good." Following this line of interpretation, it is possible to reach the conclusion in regard to the New Deal, that "in its broad outlines," the philosophy behind the program of the Roosevelt administration is "a philosophy essentially Jeffersonian."

The reviewer wishes to add only his belief that in attempting to decide what a great figure from a past period would say and do now, it is necessary to learn his spirit and attitude. His words and actions when living furnish a poor guide,

except as they reveal his spirit and tendency. Jefferson was a liberal with a deep interest in human welfare throughout his life. If here now, he would still be a liberal, and, regardless of what he may have said or done in his day, he would speak as a liberal and act in the interest of the people at large, in accordance with his own reactions to the problems and conditions of our day. If a hundred books are written, they can really get no nearer than this to an answer to the question—"What would Jefferson do if here?"

Indiana University

WILLIAM O. LYNCH

The Lees of Virginia; Biography of a Family. By Burton J. Hendrick. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1935. Pp. xii, 455. Illustrations. \$3.75.)

Mr. Hendrick has "told a story" of a family "especially worthy of attention because, for two centuries, they stood well at the top of Virginia life, because they present a succession of engaging characters and because they have exercised great influence on the American state." Combining the journalist's taste for human interest with a historical sense and ability of note for a popular writer, he has told it well.

The author has steered a wise course between genealogy and disjointed biographies with the result that his book is exactly what he started out to make it, the history of a family in which the "engaging character" and those who "have exercised great influence on the American state" are given predominance, in the opinion of this reviewer, in the order mentioned. Mr. Hendrick discusses rather briefly Richard, the "Emigrant," and his son Richard. He devotes somewhat more space to Thomas, "President of Virginia." But it is to the sons of this Thomas Lee of Stratford that more than half of the book is devoted. The remaining hundred pages deal with the Lees of Leesylvania, "Light Horse Harry" Lee and his sons, Henry, the only black sheep of the family, and Robert Edward, the greatest of the clan.

From the historian's standpoint the most interesting portion of the book is that part dealing with the sons of Thomas Lee and his wife, Hannah Ludwell Lee, Philip Ludwell, who succeeded to his father's place on the Council of Virginia; Thomas Ludwell; Richard Henry and Francis Lightfoot, signers of the Declaration of Independence; and William and Arthur, "militia diplomats" during the Revolution.

The treatment of Richard Henry Lee, mover of American Independence and the Articles of Confederation and one of the strongest workers for the Bill of Rights in the Federal Constitution, seems, to this reviewer, to have some faults. Mr. Hendrick, in writing of Lee's career in the House of Burgesses, overlooks the significance of the division which existed between the Potomac planters and the James River group. This, rather than Lee's supposed radicalism, goes far towards explaining the hatred certain members of the Williamsburg aristocracy

felt for him. In another place Mr. Hendrick speaks of the "dour and Puritanical phase of his nature." Surely, an honest and courageous man can be impatient with dishonesty, graft, and timidity without being called "dour and Puritanical." At least he can in Virginia.

Arthur evidently seemed to the author the most "engaging character" in the entire family since about a third of the book is devoted to him. And it is in the treatment of Arthur Lee that the author is at his best. With the exception of Professor Abernethy's article in volume thirty-nine of the *American Historical Review*, on which Mr. Hendrick's treatment seems to be partially based, no attempt, to the knowledge of this reviewer, has ever been made to give Arthur Lee his due. There was certainly "something rotten" in the American commission to France during the Revolution but the fact that Lee said it was the commercial activities of Silas Deane, America's first "lame-duck" who was supported by Franklin, still the number one sacred cow of American history, has led too many historians to blame Lee as an oversuspicious psychopath. The author exposes Deane convincingly but steers suspiciously wide of implicating Poor Richard's creator whose worshippers are still legion. But whether or not Franklin was dealt with too leniently, the four chapters dealing with the Lee-Deane dispute are the most complete and authentic treatment of the affair in print today.

The remainder of the work, about a hundred pages, dealing with Henry Lee and his sons, continues the story of the Lee family in its relation to American history to its end in Robert Edward, last of the "eighteenth century gentlemen." It is chiefly notable for an interesting discussion of the character of the Confederate leader.

It is a great pity that the author did not see fit to include notes and a bibliography, at least for the section dealing with Arthur Lee. Their absence is all that prevents these chapters from clearing up matter which has been cause for dispute for almost half a century. But with or without footnotes, these chapters, if not the entire book, should be read by every student of the Revolutionary period.

King College

JOHN CARTER MATTHEWS

Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist. Volume I (1825-1845). Edited by Herbert Anthony Kellar. (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1936. Pp. xxv, 582. Illustrations. \$2.00.)

This compilation of documents from the pen of a dynamic agricultural pioneer of the ante-bellum era constitutes volume XXI of the *Indiana Historical Collections*. The Middle Period produced a substantial galaxy of experimental farmers and agricultural editors whose writings and preachments brought tangible results. What Edmund Ruffin contributed to agrarian improvement in the Southeast and Thomas Affleck to the horticultural advancement of the

Southwest, Solon Robinson sponsored for the rural development of the Northern states. According to the editor, Robinson was "nationally known as an experimental farmer, traveler, lecturer, and writer on agricultural subjects"; he was a "journalist, novelist, and short-story writer extraordinary"; and his career was "so interwoven with the history of Indiana and the nation, as to present a fascinating panorama of American civilization North and South" (p. xi).

A few of the documents included in the volume were preserved in manuscript collections, but most of them were contributed to Indiana and Ohio newspapers and to such periodicals as the *Albany Cultivator*, the *American Agriculturist*, the *Union Agriculturist*, the *Prairie Farmer*, and the *Western Farmer and Gardener*. Robinson wrote upon such diverse subjects as "Nutmeg Potatoes," "Beans and Buckwheat," "The Bur Oak," "Mammoth Sunflower," "Rust in Wheat," "Plan for a Farm House," "How to Save a Drowning Horse," and quite frequently upon just "Odds and Ends." He gave sound advice to prospective emigrants to the West and he was eloquent in his descriptions of pioneer hardships. He passed on to others his favorite recipes, the results of his experiments in raising grain and vegetables, the advantages of keeping improved breeds of stock, and the necessity of providing educational facilities on the frontier. Robinson initiated a movement to establish a national society of agriculture, and promoted the project through numerous contributions to agricultural periodicals. Of special interest to students of Southern history are his journeys into the South, the first of which—through Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi in 1845—finds a place in the present volume. In contrast to Frederick L. Olmsted and sundry other travelers, Robinson identified farmers and planters whom he visited and thus rendered historians an incalculable service.

Mr. Kellar has performed his editorial obligations with scholarly precision. A calendar lists the agriculturist's known writings in the two decades following 1825 and stars those which are included in the compilation. The introduction presents Robinson's entire career in brief compass, and evaluates his contributions to agriculture and literature. The documents have been accurately reproduced and copiously footnoted with explanatory material and citations to sources. Aside from a few awkward footnote expressions and a pardonable number of typographical errors, the work is in most acceptable form. Eleven illustrations afford visual introduction to Robinson and his wife, to maps and plats, to cabins and cottages, to the Squatters' Constitution of 1836, and to the Show Ground of the Utica State Fair in 1845. Mr. Kellar has devoted much of his time during a decade to the assembling of materials and the mechanics of editing, and one lays the first volume aside with the hope that the second will soon be available.

Roger B. Taney. By Carl Brent Swisher. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1935. Pp. x, 608. Bibliography, illustrations. \$5.00.)

Carl Brent Swisher's *Roger B. Taney* presents the "great Chief Justice" (p. 582, quoting Chief Justice Hughes) on the background of the forces operating in the United States from Taney's birth in Calvert County, Maryland, in 1777, until his death in 1864. Assuming that there was a clear-cut issue of "right" and "wrong" in the great controversies with which Taney was identified, historians such as Burgess, Rhodes, Channing, McMaster, and Bassett have "proved an effective barrier to an understanding and appreciation of Taney" (p. 583). Little inquiry has been made into the undergirding social forces which played upon Taney to produce his philosophy of life and which constrained him, as chief justice, to supplement or even supersede positive law with some "brooding omnipresence in the sky" (p. 442, quoting Justice Holmes). To many historians, Taney was merely a "pliant instrument" of Jackson in the bank war and a willing conspirator with the "lords of the shackle" in the Dred Scott decision.

Mr. Swisher has made a more objective approach to the study of Taney's life, character, and influence. Taney's ideas of the "good society" came out of his heritage as a member of the landed aristocracy of the South. The predominantly rural and agricultural South had ever to be on the alert to protect itself against "predatory financial interests." "For generations the southern planters, unable to help themselves, paid heavy tribute to the merchant-shipper-middleman-creditor class. A well-warranted distrust of the greed of this class . . . was bred into the fiber of southern society through generations of hard experience" (p. 584). As a representative of the interests of the planter community, Taney, as early as the War of 1812, began to break away from the Federalist party which was becoming more and more the party of New England and of the merchant and shipping class in other parts of the country (p. 80). It is not surprising, therefore, that Taney later failed to adhere to the doctrines of the Whigs, the legitimate successors of the Federalists. For the Whigs represented "aristocracy in shipping, in banking, and in industry, but not predominantly in land" (p. 585). Keenly conscious of the financial interest of his group, Taney "approached the war with the bank of the United States not as a narrow politician nor as a mere theorist on money and banking problems, but as a man who knew both the aims and strategy of the opposing forces. His purpose was largely defensive. He set out to protect the country from a powerful organization of the forces from whose predatory instincts the South, and agricultural interests everywhere, were traditional sufferers" (pp. 584-85).

As chief justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Taney was to redirect somewhat the constitutional trends worked out by John Marshall and "the Godlike Daniel." Under Marshall, the Court, in spite of such leaders as Thomas Jefferson and Judge Spencer Roane, had made itself "the kingpin of

the lawyer-property alliance" (p. 350). Mainly, the decisions of the Marshall Period asserted that the states were prohibited from legislating in a manner hostile to property (p. 348). Inasmuch as Taney became chief justice as a part of a governmental regime basically opposed to the principles for which Marshall stood, the proponents of the old order feared that the Court would give up its guardianship over "the rights of property and leave it to the mercy of the state legislatures dominated by the mass of the people" (p. 531). The Court took the middle-of-the-road position. In a series of decisions over a period of twenty years, Taney led the majority of the Court to give a narrow interpretation to the legal rights of corporations. In these decisions, the Court for the first time showed an awareness to "community rights" as well as "the rights of property" (p. 380). On the questions of the exclusiveness of the power of Congress over interstate commerce and the power of the states to prohibit the importation of slaves, Taney said "no" to the former proposition and "yes" to the latter (p. 400). He relied upon the power of state sovereignty—that if the states had not clearly surrendered powers by the Constitution the right to legislate was not to be limited by the Supreme Court (p. 410).

The Dred Scott decision is discussed with a view to making possible "a sympathetic understanding of what Taney was attempting to do" (p. 503). With singular devotion to the South of which he was a part, Taney hoped, by declaring the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional, to destroy an effective abolitionist weapon and thus possibly avoid disaster. Such "plotting of strategy" to save the country in time of crisis was possibly not properly a judicial function. "Nevertheless, the fact remains that most of the judicial decisions that stand out as landmarks in the minds of students of American history and of constitutional law have been policy-making decisions. This has been true all the way from the regime of John Marshall to that of Charles Evans Hughes. . . . It is inconsistent to denounce Taney for deciding questions broadly in the hope of benefiting the country, while praising others, Marshall for instance, for doing the same thing. . . . The question is not one of narrowness or breadth of decision, but as to the nature of the order which the particular judge is seeking to preserve. People with a rabid abolitionist point of view believed that, in so far as southern culture rested upon slavery, it was not worth preserving. Taney believed that southern culture and southern independence were worth saving, whether it meant the preservation of slavery on the one hand, of which he was no zealous advocate, or civil war on the other. He wrote his opinion in the Dred Scott case in an attempt to aid in preserving it" (p. 505).

The mechanical make-up of the volume is attractive, and it is remarkably free from errors. The author has availed himself of much heretofore unused manuscript material. He has produced not only a biography of Taney but also an excellent interpretation of the controversies of the day.

Letters of Eliab Parker Mackintire of Boston Written between 1845 and 1863, to Reverend William Salter of Burlington, Iowa. Edited by Philip Dillon Jordan. (New York: The New York Public Library, 1936. Pp. v, 168. Frontispiece. \$1.25.)

Eliab Parker Mackintire was a Boston merchant of moderate to wealthy circumstances, when he began writing this series of letters to his prospective son-in-law. William Salter, a Congregational missionary to Iowa, came East shortly afterward to marry Mackintire's only daughter. Mackintire later retired from the mercantile business, became engaged in manufacturing and head of an insurance company.

The letters reveal nothing about the West except indirectly through the observations of Mackintire who corresponded regularly with his children and made several trips to Burlington. On the other hand, they are a perfect mirror of the philosophy of a New England gentleman whose three chief interests in life were his business, his religion, and education. A deep solicitude for the material comforts of his children is present in nearly all of the letters; also, no end of canny advice with respect to the management of personal and church finances. He questioned the advisability of building a home on a mere two acre lot if there was any probability that land would increase in value as the village population grew. He urged Reverend Salter to keep a cash account of "receipts and expenditures," for reasons as "thick as blackberries."

Mackintire was not fond of the ways of the West. Its ungodliness, its crudity, its feverish political strife, and its meager educational facilities were especially annoying to him; but his reaction was a genuine and generous contribution of time, money, and interest to that section's improvement. He insisted upon the need for extraordinary efforts toward establishing a public school system in Iowa to forestall the growth of 'Romanism'; but, also, because every child was entitled to a common school education "as much as he is entitled to a support from his parents." To that end, he gave liberally of his own resources to Salter's church, to Iowa College, and for books. He wrote extensively of the school system in Charlestown, Boston, and Chicago. His interest was more than that of a father. Speaking of the rapidity with which New England was gaining a monopoly of Western trade, he said: "The same resources that can support the trade can throw a religious influence into every part of it, until New England institutions are established from the lakes to the shores of the Pacific, and you may travel from the Atlantic to the Pacific and every six miles find a New England Village with its church spires pointing to the skies, and the school by its side."

This same desire to promote the cultural influence of New England over the West, formed the basis of Mackintire's position on the slavery question. He was an expansionist, but believed the Mexican War to have been promoted to gain more slave territory. The one ray of light in the possible outcome of the

venture was freedom for the Mexicans from the domination of the Catholic Church, a plight little better than that of the slave in the United States. He was opposed to the excesses of the Garrisonian Abolitionists, because they retarded the progress of antislavery sentiment; but with respect to slaveholders, he could say: "providence seems to be against them—all good men must be against them. The voice of the civilized world is against them. Humanity cries out against them." He deplored the public eulogies of John Brown and particularly comparisons of his death to that of Christ on the Cross as "blasphemous." He expressed a desire that he might not live to see the two sections arrayed against each other.

With respect to the objectives of the antislavery party, Mackintire insisted that they should be confined to the exclusion of slavery from the territories and of more slave states from the Union. The Civil War, he firmly believed, was supported with great unanimity at the North as a war "to *sustain* the government and the *Constitution*." That, and not the abolition of slavery, was to him the only purpose which could "justify it in the sight of Heaven, or in the opinion of the Civilized World."

University of Michigan

DWIGHT L. DUMOND

The Civil War Letters of Colonel Hans Christian Heg. Edited by Theodore C. Blegen. (Northfield, Minnesota: Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1936. Pp. ix, 260. Frontispiece, illustrations. \$2.50.)

To those who are specialists neither in Norwegian-American history nor in the local history of Wisconsin, the name of Hans Christian Heg probably has been virtually meaningless. With the appearance of Professor Blegen's volume, however, this condition is not likely to continue. Published by the Norwegian-American Historical Association, *The Civil War Letters of Colonel Hans Christian Heg* places at the convenient disposal of scholars a series of as colorful letters as have been assembled between the covers of a book for some time. There is nothing in them of any fundamental importance to our knowledge of the Civil War. They mark no point of departure for the "revisionist." Nevertheless, they contribute some interesting military detail, much in the way of atmosphere, and a considerable insight into the mind of a foreign-born soldier of the sixties. Furthermore, they reveal a little-known personality, who, but for an untimely death on the field of Chickamauga, might have developed into a Norwegian Carl Schurz.

Heg was born in Norway in 1829 and brought to America by his parents in 1840. With little formal education, he was fortunate that his father's barn became a social and religious center for the Norwegians in the surrounding territory, and a stopping point for new Western immigrants. In this atmosphere the boy developed rapidly.

The death of his parents in 1842 and 1850, an overland trek to the gold fields of California and return, marriage in 1851, and an early identification with the Republican party ushered him into manhood. A successful career in local politics was interrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War, and Heg, commissioned colonel by the governor of Wisconsin, threw himself into the work of recruiting a Norwegian-American regiment to vie with the Germans and Irish who had already entered the service. The Fifteenth Wisconsin, with which Heg lived faithfully and died nobly in the eighteen months of his military service, was the product. He never rose above the rank of colonel, although he served for a time as an acting brigadier general. But Wisconsin looked beyond his rank, and his statue now stands in the yard of the statehouse at Madison.

Professor Blegen, however, felt that it was time "for another kind of monument to Colonel Heg, one that will perpetuate the man himself, not on a pedestal and in one unchanging mood, but on the plane of warm, human relations and in the varied, sometimes contradictory, moods of life itself." Such a monument are the 223 letters and the ably written 45-page biographical sketch which he now presents.

Of the letters themselves, 89 were in the possession of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin when Professor Blegen began his work. He discovered 129 more (designated Van Doren MSS.) in the hands of a great granddaughter of Heg. These have since been donated to the library. Five more were taken from the files of the Milwaukee *Sentinel*. Of the entire collection of letters, 94 are presented in full length. The remainder are abstracted or presented in excerpt.

The letters cover the period from January 16, 1862, when Heg was mustered into active service, to September 18, 1863, the day previous to his mortal wounding. They are divided into six classifications, all of them chronological. Thus there are 38 letters in part one, "From Madison to Island No. 10"; 31 in part two, "In Camp and on the March"; 23 in part three, "From Iuka to Perryville"; 35 in part four, "The Battle of Murfreesboro"; 61 in part five, "Camp Life Near Murfreesboro"; and 35 in part six, "The Chickamauga Campaign."

The most important of the letters are probably those dealing with the capture of Island No. 10 (pp. 76-77), the Battle of Perryville (pp. 143-48), and the Battle of Murfreesboro (pp. 162-73, 183-87). But there is much material of considerable interest in the others. For example, there is the flavor of a volunteer force to be found in the drunkenness of the soldiers in Chicago (p. 60), families traveling with the soldiers (pp. 60, 69), homesickness (p. 136), the expression "The Track is getting fresh—and cowards get sick" (p. 63), and the raw recruit's passion for trophies and souvenirs to be sent home (pp. 72, 75-78, 80). There is the startling commentary on the uncensored nature of the

news coming from the army to be found in military maps of the situation around Island No. 10 (facing p. 62) and of Camp Erickson, Mississippi (facing p. 116) which were sent home by Heg. There is also the breath of the New West in Heg's genial boastfulness (pp. 73, 118, 124, 159, 232) and in his optimism. The man had a seemingly irrepressible belief, possibly designed for home consumption, that the war could not last much longer and that he was fighting under the benign influence of a lucky star (*passim*).

Professor Blegen has used the cream of this material in his well-documented, pithy, biographical sketch which is based not merely on the letters at hand, but on the scanty secondary materials dealing with Heg and on the Norwegian press. He is not deluded as to Heg's position in history. He states quite baldly that his subject's importance lies chiefly in the fact that "his life story typifies processes of transition that have marked the lives of thousands of immigrants." But he feels that "the unreserved record of his [Heg's] thoughts and emotions, poured out in the intimacy of family letters, filled with pictures swiftly sketched amid the swirl of events, crowded with personal detail, and flavored with a deep family affection" are worthy of wider dissemination. This reviewer, for one, agrees with him.

Colgate University

CHARLES R. WILSON

General John T. Wilder, Commander of the Lightning Brigade. By Samuel C. Williams. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1936. Pp. x, 105. Bibliography. \$1.50.)

Any person is worthy of a biography whose activities in deed and fact have transcended his own community. As Judge Williams indicates, minor biographies, or rather those of persons considered secondary, when their careers are sketched in proper perspective, add very materially to our common storehouse of knowledge. This short sketch of General Wilder is timely and aids not only in defining the career of him more clearly, but in forming a truer conception of men with whom he was associated, commonly considered greater, as well as making the locale of their operation more concrete.

The biography is disappointing in that every phase of a long life except his military career is treated so very briefly. John Thomas Wilder was born of English ancestry in New York and, after receiving only an elementary education, went West at the age of nineteen and was engaged to work in a foundry in Columbus, Ohio. Here he remained some eight years and was so successful he was offered a partnership in the business. This he declined and removed to Greensburg, Indiana, where he became the owner of a small foundry which he operated until the outbreak of the Civil War. Only a few lines more than two pages are used in the sketch to tell the story of his career thus far.

The author sketches well the three years of Wilder's military career. Naturally

this being the exciting, glamorous, perhaps the most fascinating period of his career, there is more material to write about. The author in his preface says that no history of it has yet been written, but makes the challenging assertion that "no single brigade of that war earned such renown as did Wilder's Lightning Brigade." Wilder enlisted at Greensburg with the Seventeenth Indiana Infantry, as captain, but soon became a lieutenant colonel. He first saw active service with his regiment at Cheat Mountain in western Virginia. Late in the fall of 1861, the Seventeenth Indiana was sent to Louisville, where it was incorporated in Buell's Army of the Ohio. Early in 1862 Wilder became colonel of his regiment, saw service in Alabama, Tennessee, and Kentucky, and by September of that year he was stationed on the south side of Green River at Munfordville with about 3500 men to guard a railroad bridge. There he was surrounded by nearly all of Bragg's army. After a gallant defense, during which he was repeatedly asked to surrender, he did a very unique thing in military history. He asked advice from General Simon B. Buckner, the Confederate commander under Bragg, in direct charge, as to what he ought to do in his predicament. Buckner's and Wilder's stories about the incident differ in detail but are mainly in agreement on the final result. Wilder surrendered the fort to Bragg, and the latter designated Buckner to receive his sword. Wilder ever afterward blamed Buell, who was then on his march to Louisville to intercept Bragg, for not rescuing him at Munfordville.

Wilder's brigade did heroic work at Chattanooga and also at Chickamauga. It became equipped with Spencer rifles, and was mounted part of the time as a cavalry force. Soon after the battle of Chickamauga, Wilder was made a brigadier general. In the fall of 1864, ill health forced his resignation from the army after a very honorable service. In 1866 he left Indiana and lived until his death in 1917 in East Tennessee, most of the time at Chattanooga and Johnson City.

But after more than three years of military strife, Wilder had yet more than fifty years to live, during which he engaged in a daring and brilliant business career. He devoted the half century to invention and industry, involving iron manufacturing and coal mining in eastern Tennessee, in a region he had earlier fought over as enemy's country. To this remarkable business venture, when Wilder really became a successful promoter of the New South, only about nine printed pages are given in the biography. It is regrettable that the author, who knew General Wilder personally, did not enlarge more on the later and more important part of a long and useful life. Wilder was a man of fine appearance, and the author depicts well his sterling character. While holding several positions of honor and trust, mostly appointive, he was essentially a business man and too frank to be a politician.

Judge Williams uses a free, easy style in his narrative; interest never flags, and anyone who reads the biography will express regret at its brevity. The

citations include a long list of good secondary authorities, and the footnotes are invaluable. The appendixes of nearly fifty pages include a collection of very interesting and important data. A table of contents and index are omitted, but, due to the book's size, this may be pardoned. Mechanically, the book is splendidly printed in large, clear type, and is attractively bound. The little volume will be read with profit by anyone caring to know about a virile, active, much-loved man, whose memory should be perpetuated.

Western Kentucky State Teachers College

A. M. STICKLES

James Longstreet: Lee's War Horse. By H. J. Eckenrode and Bryan Conrad. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936. Pp. viii, 399. Illustrations. \$3.50.)

This book which purports to be a biography of the controversial First Corps commander of the Army of Northern Virginia, whose conduct and character continue in Southern patriotic circles to provide a source of discord, is really a study of his Civil War record. An initial seven pages are devoted to the first forty years of Longstreet's life, and a concluding seven pages cover the thirty-nine years subsequent to the Civil War. Manifestly, then, a book which devotes only fourteen pages to seventy-nine years of a man's life can hardly be termed his biography. This disproportionate treatment, from the biographical viewpoint, may well be due to the paucity of materials, or to the authors' conviction that the Civil War career of Longstreet alone possesses historical interest.

In their preface the writers point out the fact, familiar to readers of Civil War military history, that the career of Longstreet, except incidentally, has never received historical attention. The Lee and Jackson literature fills many shelves. Generals of lesser note, Northern and Southern, have been the subject of biography. Yet Longstreet, who certainly played a rôle in Confederate war history second to none beside Lee, and perhaps Jackson prior to 1863, has never been the subject of biography until Mr. Eckenrode and Colonel Conrad turned out this book, which is therefore a pioneer work. Prior to the publication of this book, the Longstreet literature consisted of his own *Apologia pro sua vita*, which he called *From Manassas to Appomattox*, and the fiercely partisan but loving tribute of his widow, Mrs. Helen Dortch Longstreet, which she published in 1905 under the title *Lee and Longstreet at High Tide*.

The authors of this book should be well prepared for their task. Mr. Eckenrode, known to all readers of Southern history, is the Historian of the Virginia Conservation and Development Commission, and Colonel Conrad is the Assistant Historian of the same Commission and a colonel in the United States Army. The writers have depended largely, so they tell us, on that primary source for all writers in Civil War military history, the voluminous records of both Confederate and Union governments, collected and printed by the United

States government under a title, which still irks some who use them, *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*. The writers have further, according to their preface, "made a careful examination of the ground around Richmond and at Mannassas and Fredericksburg as well as around Sharpsburg and Gettysburg." The result for the most part is a very clear, though sometimes sketchy and foreshortened, exposition of the salient features of terrain, strategic objectives, and tactical movements involved in the various campaigns and battles in which Longstreet figured.

And this was nearly every battle and campaign involving the Army of Northern Virginia, with certain additional ones, such as the independent Suffolk expedition in the spring of 1863, and the East Tennessee campaigns around Knoxville and Chattanooga in the autumn of that year. The Suffolk project prevented Longstreet and two of his divisions from being present at Chancellorsville, and a severe wound received in the Wilderness fighting of May 6, 1864, removed him from active service until October 14; but with these exceptions he was personally on the field during every major operation of the Army of Northern Virginia from first Bull Run to the surrender. It is doubtful if any division or corps commander, Union or Confederate, saw as much fighting as did Longstreet. Primarily a defensive fighter, he was often slow on the offensive, hard to get into action, but having once got in, he displayed all the tenacity of the bull dog. Lee dubbed him "War Horse."

The space allotted to this review precludes consideration of the many controversies which cluster about Longstreet, including the two most bitter of all, his conduct at Gettysburg and his postwar political course. Regarding the first, there is no doubt that he thoroughly disapproved of the Gettysburg fight, and that his failure to co-operate promptly and heartily there destroyed any chance Lee might have had for victory after the night of July 1. Regarding the second, it may be said that other men turned Republican after the war and accepted office, including the dedoubtable Joseph E. Brown, war governor of Georgia.

Longstreet to his biographers is no hero without reproach. Recognizing his rugged strength and military abilities, they do not hesitate to lay bare the faults of his character. They ascribe to him jealousy of superiors and colleagues, especially Lee, self-assertiveness and egotism, pride of opinion, a certain fundamental lack of generosity as regards his fellow man, a reluctance to co-operate where failure to do so meant disaster, a stubbornness which could, and did sometimes, lead to tragedy, and above all a consuming selfishness. In their own harsh judgment, "Longstreet always thought first of himself, secondarily of the cause" (p. 368).

From the student's standpoint the book suffers from inadequate documentation. Pen and ink sketches of the battlefields help the reader to an understanding. There is an adequate index.

French Opinion on the United States and Mexico, 1860-1867; Extracts from the Reports of the Procureurs Généraux. Compiled and edited by Lynn M. Case. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936. Pp. xxiii, 452. \$7.00.)

This volume, published by the Beveridge Memorial Fund, is an important contribution to the history of the Second Empire. It makes available extracts from the quarterly reports of the Procureurs Généraux, which constitute one of the main sources by which Napoleon III kept in touch with public opinion. The Procureurs Généraux were "the legal agents of the ministry of justice in the twenty-eight districts of the Imperial Courts," each of these districts embracing three départements. The reports constitute the largest and most reliable body of confidential opinion presented to the government during the period of the American Civil War and the Mexican Expedition. They are doubly important since the reports of the prefects are either missing for this period or too brief to be of value regarding foreign affairs.

Professor Case has grouped 710 extracts from this rich store under the following three heads: "The Influence of the American Civil War on French Industries," "French Opinion on the American Civil War," and "French Opinion on the Mexican Expedition." He contributes a general introduction, an introduction to the first section, and introductions to each of the seven chapters in the last two sections.

To the reviewer, the greatest value of the volume lies in its excellent picture of French industry, a field in which it breaks much new ground. Not only are industries identified by locality, but there is information on technical development and working conditions. The book might well be the basis for a series of local studies in French economic history.

Fundamentally, the American Civil War affected French industry in two ways. It cut off the supply of raw materials, particularly cotton, and closed a rich market to French manufacturers, goods which America purchased with cotton. This volume gives the usual picture of distress in the cotton business: first, fear of shortage, then the rise of prices, the scarcity of staple, the final accommodation to Indian or Egyptian cotton, and the use of wool and linen as substitutes. It is most interesting to see how widespread was the distress caused by the closing of American markets. The following industries were reported as languishing because of the war: silk, ribbon, gloves, porcelain, paper, velours, wool, lace, embroidery, wine, eaux-de-vie, lead, tanneries, hats, musical instruments, cutlery, glass, plush, corsets, knitting, wadding, dyes, madder, starch, baskets, perfume, iron, crayons, and glue. Conditions began to improve in 1863 and, except for brief relapses, continued to do so to the end of the war.

In view of current discussion regarding the cotton policies of the Roosevelt administration it is interesting to note that cotton was being produced in Brazil even at this time, and that the Alsatian manufacturers formed companies for

growing cotton in Algeria. Also, the low quality of Indian cotton made it difficult to manufacture and resulted in an inferior product.

The reports of the Procureurs Généraux reveal a larger measure of sympathy for the South than has hitherto been suspected. Except for a brief period of support of the North at the beginning of the war, the good wishes of Frenchmen were on the side of the Southerners, whom they regarded as being like themselves. There are several references to the French character of Louisiana. It was felt that the North could not conquer the South and that the war might drag on interminably. In offering to mediate, Napoleon III was backed by a strong public sentiment favoring intervention. After 1863 Frenchmen became bored with the long struggle, and all save the manufacturers, who would lose by the drop of cotton prices, hoped for its conclusion. Lincoln's re-election was opposed, in the hope that his defeat would bring peace, but by 1865 opinion was more favorable to him, and his assassination was regarded with genuine sorrow.

There should be little doubt that these documents reflect the true state of opinion on Napoleon's Mexican venture. Frank disapproval of the Emperor's intervention is almost unanimous. After the French defeat at Puebla there was acquiescence in measures for the recovery of national honor, but evacuation was desired as soon as a victory could be achieved. The establishment of Maximilian's Empire was welcomed only because it afforded a means of withdrawing from a venture costly in blood and money. Public opinion heartily endorsed the evacuation in 1867.

The reports of the Procureurs Généraux must be used with caution, as Professor Case well realizes, but they do seem to be a better index of public opinion than the newspapers and parliamentary debates of the Second Empire. The way has been opened to an important body of material which no student of Napoleon III or the American Civil War can afford to neglect.

Professor Case's introductions are commendable and his editorial work is good. There are, however, a number of unnecessary and obvious references which might well have been eliminated. There is a map of the districts of the Courts of Appeal before 1871 and a good index.

Colgate University

E. WILSON LYON

Cyrus Hall McCormick. By William T. Hutchinson. Volume I, *Seed-Time, 1809-1856*. (New York: Century Company, 1930. Pp. xiv, 493. Illustrations, charts, bibliography. \$5.00.) Volume II, *Harvest, 1856-1884*, (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935. Pp. x, 793. Illustrations, charts, bibliography. \$5.50.)

In the first of these two heavily documented volumes, which preceded the second by five years and which also preceded the first number of the *Journal of Southern History*, Professor Hutchinson presents a picture of the Rockbridge

County section of the Valley of Virginia and of its sturdy Scotch-Irish settlers in the opening quarter of the nineteenth century. Here, in an environment of Scotch thrift and Calvinist theology, Cyrus McCormick was born three days after the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Born at a time when such agricultural leaders as Edmund Ruffin and John Taylor of Caroline were urging the more widespread use of manures, the improvement of stock, and the use of labor saving machinery; born, moreover, in a household whose head was of a decidedly inventive turn of mind, and in a region where wheat was one of the most important crops, it is not surprising that the youth set himself to solve a generally recognized problem. That the time was ripe is evidenced by the fact that others, among them Obed Hussey, William and Thomas Schnebly, William Manning, Enoch Ambler, Abram Randall, and Alexander M. Wilson, were trying to find a way to substitute horsepower for human labor in the harvesting of grain. Unfortunately, in later years a family dispute arose among the McCormick brothers as to the relative credit due Robert, the father, and Cyrus, the son. In the reviewer's opinion a conclusive case is made out in favor of the son.

Five years after the construction of the reaper in 1831 McCormick, to whom the speculative made a strong appeal, began a venture in iron mining which, over a period of ten years, yielded him little or no income, much worry, but also much experience.

During these trying years McCormick had resumed his experiments and for a number of years he and Obed Hussey submitted their inventions to the sharpest competition by entering wheat fields and demonstrating to assembled farmers what their reapers could do. Both now and for many years to come, and both at home and abroad, the inventor relied heavily upon these competitive demonstrations for opening the market to the McCormick reaper. The choice of Chicago as the center of his operations in 1847 seems to have been most wise. The demand rapidly increased, some years going well beyond the power of the factory to satisfy, until the Virginia inventor, not as inventor but as keen, restless, farsighted business man, counted his fortune in millions and clearly led the country in the output of harvesters.

McCormick was a man of many interests. Whether as Democratic Unionist during the Civil War, or as investor in railroads or Credit Mobilier, or as adventurer in gold and silver mining, or as high official and adviser in the Democratic party, or as benefactor of theological seminaries or of the Presbyterian church, or as manufacturer of the reaper, he insisted upon placing the stamp of his personality upon all his interests.

Professor Hutchinson has given us, in the main, an exhaustive, authoritative, illuminating account of an interesting character in an interesting period of our history. The lately and widely expressed concern over the social and economic consequences that would follow the general introduction of a successful cotton

reaper is perhaps the explanation of the reviewer's regret that some attempt was not made in this study to include a chapter on the social and economic consequences attributable to the introduction of the reaper. Regret may be expressed also that the study does not make clear whether or not McCormick's political interests were closely and consciously related to his economic interests. The study clearly indicates that he did not hesitate to use his economic power to bend theological teaching to his own theological views by imposing upon seminaries conditions to be met if they expected to enjoy gifts from his none too lavish hand. But he was not the first to confuse the God who created us with the gods whom we create.

The well selected illustrations add to the attractiveness of the volumes which are almost wholly free from typographical errors. Almost every page attests the great industry of the author in using the many thousands of documents in the library of the McCormick Historical Association, and the bibliographical guide and the index are further evidences that thoroughness of investigation and care in publication characterize this study.

Randolph-Macon College

E. L. Fox

History of Jackson County, Alabama. By John Robert Kennamer. (Winchester, Tennessee: Southern Printing and Publishing Company, 1935. Pp. 210. Frontispiece. \$1.00.)

Jackson County was originally a part of the Cherokee country. Pioneer hunters, trappers, and traders, following well-known Indian trails, trickled into the region during the Revolutionary War period. North Carolinians in 1783 and South Carolinians in 1789 failed in their attempts to plant a colony. The surrender of South Carolina and Georgia claims to this region was followed by an influx of settlers—a part of the general southwestward migration after 1812, primarily due to the urge of "King Cotton." Flatboats, covered wagons, and pack horses brought many settlers from Tennessee, the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Kentucky. Poorer classes moved into the mountain or hill country while wealthier classes sought the more favored cotton country. Cotton planters sent their product down the Tennessee River, across the rapids at Muscle Shoals, and thence to New Orleans. Supplies were received from Nashville across country or from Knoxville down the river.

The Cherokee cessions of 1819 and 1835 removed the last Indian claims to the region and in the former year Jackson County was organized, being named for "Old Hickory." Development was rapid. Indian trails were widened and fresh roads cut. Steamboats soon followed. Towns, schools, churches, and newspapers made their appearance at an early date. Railroads came in the fifties. Undeveloped mineral resources attracted many Northerners.

Jackson County voted against secession. Many of its citizens either deserted

or acted as Union scouts and guides but the bulk of the population supported the Confederacy. The county furnished leaders such as General John B. Gordon. It also supplied saltpeter in quantities for the army and served as a battleground for the forces of General Sherman, Colonel Roddy, and others. The "Tragic Era" was followed by disturbing agrarian movements which soon gave way to the "Gay Nineties." Recent history has been featured by steady growth and progress.

Writing a county history is admittedly a difficult task. Mr. Kennamer, after years of preparation, has produced a well-written and interesting social and economic history of his county in which an invaluable record is preserved and local pride stimulated. The outstanding chapters are those giving detailed descriptions of valleys, coves, and towns and those dealing with the early life of the settlers, wars, and the "Gay Nineties." Little emphasis is placed on politics or on the period since 1900. Of the thirty-four chapters, several are unbalanced, ranging from two to seventeen pages. Other faults are: a limited bibliography in the preface; no footnotes or index; very little use of letters or diaries; absence of population statistics; scant consideration of panics; inadequate treatment of the "other side" of the Civil War; and the omission of the World War period.

Alabama Polytechnic Institute

A. W. REYNOLDS

Today and Yesterday in the Heart of Virginia; A Reprint of the Edition of the Farmville Herald, March 29, 1935. (Farmville, Virginia: the Farmville Herald, 1935. Pp. 427. Illustrations. \$5.00.)

Today and Yesterday in the Heart of Virginia appeared first as an edition of the Farmville Herald for March 29, 1935, being reprinted later in book form. It attempts to picture the counties of Buckingham, Cumberland, and Prince Edward as they are today, as well as to describe their past.

No attempt is made to blend the various phases of economic and social development into a coherent story, beginning with an early period and continuing down to the present. Instead, there are brought together countless short articles, sketches, and reminiscences, each by a different author and each dealing with some particular aspect of the past or present scene. Part of the writing was done by the staff of the Farmville Herald, but most of the contributions were by local writers and citizens of the Farmville area.

The articles vary a great deal in historical and literary merit. Some are well-organized and clearly expressed. Others are poorly constructed and errors in punctuation are frequent. Occasional typographical errors are to be found. The book has an index which covers principal events and names, and this is sufficient for most purposes. Few articles carry either footnotes or bibliography.

The work is divided into three parts. The first, "Honor for the Present,"

describes the contemporary commercial, educational, and agricultural status of the three counties and also their community organizations. The second, "Honor for the Past," gives brief histories of each of the three counties, together with a description of old homes and families of this section. The third, "Hope for the Future," is devoted to church history and to biography, both of which might have been included in part two.

Part one is the poorest of the three. The numerous short items dealing with local organizations and business firms meet the demands of local patriotism and civic pride. But the person living outside the Farmville section will not be particularly interested in the fact that the stockholders of the Hotel Weyanoke are soon to receive dividends, that another firm renders "dignified funeral direction," or that "the shadows have come to life" upon the silver screen of the Eaco Theater. However, the chapters describing the educational advantages of the Southside counties are uniformly good.

The last two parts of the book are distinctly the best. Those chapters dealing with county history are well-written, and some of them are documented. The various church histories are also very well done. The churches included are the Episcopal, Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Lutheran.

One sketch of more than passing interest is that concerning what was probably the fourth oldest law school in America, at Needham. Established by Judge Creed Taylor in his home county of Cumberland in 1821, it was a celebrated school during its brief life of fifteen or twenty years.

Other chapters of considerable interest and value are those listing the famous homes and families of Prince Edward, Cumberland, and Buckingham. While lack of data has unfortunately shortened the story of the old homes, the genealogist may nevertheless find some information in the brief family histories that are given. Adding to the value of these chapters are several cuts of famous old homes, such as Saratoga, in whose garden wall Jefferson is supposed to have seen the original of his famous serpentine walls. Little mention is made of either the architecture or furnishings of most of the homes.

While *Today and Yesterday in the Heart of Virginia* will appeal mostly to the people living near Farmville, it will also have a limited number of readers who live outside this district.

Winthrop College

MARY T. ARMENTROUT

Historical News and Notices

The program committee for the second annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, which will convene in Nashville, November 19-21, announces that arrangements are nearing completion. Quite properly the meeting will open on Thursday evening with a session devoted to "Tennessee History," sponsored by the Tennessee Historical Society, the East Tennessee Historical Society, and the Southern Historical Association. Judge John H. DeWitt, president of the Tennessee Historical Society, will preside, and papers will be presented on "Some Aspects of Sectionalism in Tennessee," by Mary Swan Carroll of Mary Baldwin College; "State Aid to Internal Improvements in Tennessee," by Stanley J. Folmsbee of the University of Tennessee; "Isaac Franklin, Tennessee Planter and Slave Trader," by Wendell H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University; and "Tennessee's Attitude toward the Impeachment of Andrew Johnson," by James W. Patton of Converse College.

The Friday morning session, at which D. D. Wallace of Wofford College will preside, will treat "The American Revolution in the South." Papers will be read by Philip Davidson of Agnes Scott College on "Jonathan Boucher, Loyalist"; by Douglas C. McMurtrie of Chicago on the "Relations of the Printing Press of the Southern Colonies to the American Revolution"; and by Edmund C. Burnett of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. A luncheon conference on "Materials for Research" has been scheduled for Friday noon. William K. Boyd of Duke University will preside, and the discussion will be led by T. D. Clark of the University of Kentucky, Lester J. Cappon of the University of Virginia, Edwin A. Davis of Louisiana State University, and Philip M. Hamer of The National Archives. The Friday afternoon session will be devoted to "The Agrarian South." Donald Davidson of Vanderbilt University will discuss "The Agrarian South, Past and Present: An Interpretation"; W. T. Couch of the University of North Carolina Press will read a paper the title of which has not yet been announced; and P. L. Rainwater of the University of Mississippi and John D. Wade of the University of Georgia will lead the discussion. E. Merton Coulter of the University of Georgia, past president of the Association, will preside at the annual dinner on Friday evening, and Charles W. Ramsdell of the University of Texas will deliver the presidential address.

Two group sessions have been arranged for Saturday morning. R. S. Cotterill of Florida State College for Women will serve as chairman of "The Old South"

section, and papers will be presented by St. Julien R. Childs of the University of South Carolina on "Malaria and Colonization"; by Ralph B. Flanders of New York University on "Ambrose Baber, Versatile Georgian"; by Culver H. Smith of the University of Chattanooga on some phase of ante-bellum journalism; and by a participant who has not yet been designated. The papers in the other Saturday morning section will center about "Europe and the South": "Spanish Cultural Influences in the South and Southwest," by Alfred B. Thomas of the University of Oklahoma; "The Court of Louis XVI and the Lees of Virginia," by Thomas P. Abernethy of the University of Virginia; "The French Directory and the United States," by E. Wilson Lyon of Colgate University; and "The Georgia Planters and the Movement for Direct Trade with the Continent," by Thomas P. Govan of Vanderbilt University. The meeting will close with a luncheon and business session Saturday noon.

The headquarters for the meeting will be at the Hotel Hermitage, where the sessions of Thursday evening, Friday morning, and Friday afternoon, and the luncheon and dinner on Friday will be held. On Saturday morning the sessions will probably be held away from the hotel, and the luncheon on Saturday will be given jointly by the educational institutions of Nashville. Other details are being worked out by the committee on local arrangements and will be announced in the printed program.

PERSONAL

A few recent changes in the Federal Archives Survey personnel in the Southern states may be noted. Dr. Richard R. Stenberg has resigned the directorship of the Survey in Texas to accept a position at Edinburg Junior College, and Mr. Roy D. Parker, formerly district supervisor of the Fort Worth area, has been appointed to succeed him. Dr. Kathleen Bruce has been designated to succeed Mr. Terry C. Durham as regional director in Virginia. Miss Edith Bell Layman, formerly project superintendent in Columbia, has been appointed regional director for South Carolina in place of Mrs. Jessie Reed Burnett, who has resigned.

Philip M. Hamer, who has directed the Survey of Federal Archives during the past year, has been appointed chief of the division of the library of The National Archives.

James W. Moffitt, assistant regional director of the Survey of Federal Archives for Oklahoma, resigned September 1 to accept appointment as secretary of the Oklahoma Historical Society.

Herbert P. Gambrell of Southern Methodist University, who has been absent on leave to act as director of Historical Exhibits of the Texas Centennial, has returned to his position but will continue to direct the Centennial collection as teaching duties permit.

James D. Glunt of the University of Florida spent the month of September in research in the Library of Congress.

Wallace E. Caldwell of the University of North Carolina has been re-elected president of the North Carolina Archaeological Society.

The following appointments may be noted: Marshall Edwards to be assistant professor of history at Washington and Lee University; Francis G. Davenport to be professor of history at Transylvania College; Glover Moore to be instructor in history at Mississippi State College; J. Allen Tower to be assistant professor of history and political science at Birmingham-Southern College; John Hope Franklin to be instructor in history at Fisk University; James L. Godfrey to be instructor in history at the University of North Carolina; Robert D. Meade to be associate professor of history at Randolph-Macon Woman's College; Daniel M. Robison to be assistant professor of history at Vanderbilt University; Edmund C. Gass to be instructor in history at the University of Tennessee; William G. Carleton to be a member of the faculty of the humanities curriculum at the University of Florida; Richard E. Yates to be professor of history at South Georgia State College; Eugene E. Pfaff to be instructor in history at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Leaves of absence have been granted to Allen W. Moger, assistant professor of history at Washington and Lee University, for study at Columbia University; to Joe B. James and Charles Hughes of the University of Florida Extension Service for further work in the field of history; to Theodore S. Currier of Fisk University for study and research at Harvard University; and to Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Florida Historical Society, whose annual meeting will be held at the University of Florida, Gainesville, on November 17, has held a series of regional meetings during the past year in Tallahassee, Sanford, Tampa, and Miami under the leadership of Joshua Coffin Chase, its president, in order to stimulate new interest in the work of the organization.

The Oklahoma Historical Society held its annual meeting at Enid, April 30-May 1. The subject matter of the program was devoted largely to the history of the Cherokee Strip and to historic places in that area. A tour of the Salt Plains was made, and the grave of the early pioneer, Pat Hennessey, was visited. The officers of the Society are Judge Thomas H. Doyle, president; Mr. Jasper Sipes, president emeritus; Dr. Emma Estill-Harbour and General William S. Key, vice-presidents; Mrs. Jessie R. Moore, treasurer; and Professor James W. Moffitt, secretary.

Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina Revolutionary battlefield sites have been organized by the National Park Service for a more effective presentation of the military campaigns of that war. Five such sites have been administratively combined under Co-ordinating Superintendent B. Floyd Flickinger of Colonial National Historical Park in order that the sequence of battles in the Southern campaign may be more effectively brought out and that each individual area may be given its proper place in a comprehensive story of the Revolutionary War in the South. Stories of the battles at Moore's Creek Bridge, North Carolina, at King's Mountain, South Carolina, at the Cowpens, South Carolina, at Guilford Court House, North Carolina, and at Yorktown, Virginia, will be co-ordinated by the National Park Service.

The placing of these historic Revolutionary areas under a single administrative head will facilitate the development of a historical program including museums, field instruction and guide service, co-operation with educational institutions and state departments of education, and the direction of research and promotion of scholarly publications in this section. Along with the historical-educational program a development plan is being formulated and will include roads, trails, restorations, and picnic and camping areas.

The Huguenot Society of South Carolina is erecting granite crosses on sites of Huguenot churches in the state.

As chairman of the Markers' Committee for the Frankfort Sesqui-Centennial celebration the secretary of the Kentucky State Historical Society, Mrs. Jouett Taylor Cannon, has arranged for the unveiling of a tablet in commemoration of the survey of the present site of Frankfort by Hancock Taylor, deputy surveyor of Fincastle County, Virginia, on July 16, 1773, and of the granting of a charter for the town of Frankfort by the Virginia Assembly to General James Wilkinson in October, 1786.

Several members of the Kentucky State Historical Society attended the annual historic celebration at Blue Licks on August 19, the sesqui-centennial of Stanford on September 11, and the unveiling of a tablet at McAfee's Station in Mercer County on September 24.

The Kentucky State Historical Society has purchased photostatic copies of volumes I and II of the "Kentucky Papers" in the Draper Collection from the Wisconsin Historical Society. Copies of other volumes are in preparation.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

During the year ending July 1, 1936, Duke University has acquired 43,964 manuscript pieces. Among the collections of particular interest are: 327 political letters (1840-1878) of George Smith Houston, Athens, Alabama; 421 personal and official letters and papers (1831-1872) of Admiral Louis Malesherbes

Goldsborough; 1735 letters relating to business and plantation (1768-1910) of Robert Leckie, a government engineer at Washington, and his son-in-law, William Hendrick, a planter; 5 political letters (1820-1843) of Henry Clay; 56 letters of Lawrence O'Bryan Branch of North Carolina, relating chiefly to secession; 19 letters (1787-1850) of Obediah Fields, a slave trader of Rockingham County, North Carolina; 317 letters and papers (1860-1890) of John W. Hinsdale, Raleigh, North Carolina, relating chiefly to the Civil War; 140 political and family papers of Willie Person Mangum, Orange County, North Carolina; 17 letters (1745-1747) of Eliza Lucas Pinckney who introduced indigo culture into South Carolina; 6 papers (1777-1811) of the St. David's Society, an educational association of Cheraw, South Carolina; 856 letters and papers (1804-1900) of Fletcher Harris Archer, a prominent lawyer of Petersburg, Virginia; 8761 papers (1720-1915) of John Clopton, chiefly valuable for the Jeffersonian period in Virginia; 285 letters and literary MSS. (1840-1896) of John Esten Cooke; 776 pieces (1817-1903) relating to the Falmouth Cotton Mills of Falmouth, Virginia; 148 letters (1733-1923) of the Garnett family, Aldie, Virginia; 3923 letters (1789-1894) of David Bullock Harris, the Confederate general; 375 letters, papers, works, etc., of George Frederick Holmes, long a distinguished professor at the University of Virginia; 3337 letters (1798-1926) of Marshall McDonald, Confederate officer and later United States Fish Commissioner, and his wife who organized the Daughters of the American Revolution; 12 letters and papers (1781-1802) of John Page of Rosewell, Virginia; Minutes (1775) of the Revolutionary Committee, Isle of Wight County, Virginia; 1535 family and political letters (1776-1898) of Alexander Robinson Boteler, prominent in West Virginia politics and the Confederate service; 29 letters addressed to Jefferson Davis (1860-1865) discussing Confederate policy; 10 volumes (1863-1864) of Confederate States Tax in Kind records for various Virginia Counties; 40 letters (1861) of John Buchanan Floyd relating to his command in northwestern Virginia; 14 warrants (1863-1865) of the Confederate States treasury department; 4 MS. volumes of James Mercer Garnett's "War Record"; and 5 letters (1862-1865) of Robert E. Lee.

A collection of original source materials, regarded as the most valuable papers relating to Territorial Florida, has been purchased by the Florida Historical Society, according to President Joshua Coffin Chase. It consists of the journal of R. K. Call, twice governor and congressional delegate, 150 letters to and from him extending from 1819 to 1860, a manuscript history of Florida written by Call's daughter, a manuscript by Call on the Seminole Indian Wars, and a number of miscellaneous papers. The Call Papers were purchased with a fund of \$500 recently raised by Professor A. J. Hanna of Rollins College.

Among recent acquisitions of the Oklahoma Historical Society may be noted the letters, reports, and books acquired from the old Sac and Fox Indian agency

near Stroud; from the Shawnee agency at Shawnee, and from the Kiowa agency at Anadarko. The Indian Archives have been moved to a permanent location in the Society's building and placed under the direction of Mrs. Rella Watts, archivist.

The Library of the University of Arkansas has acquired a complete set of Stevens' Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives Relating to America, 1773-1783, 25 boxes, together with a facsimile of British Headquarters Manuscript Map of New York (1782). All are in good condition. The Library has also acquired a scrapbook made up of clippings from newspapers, mostly in Arkansas, relating to the Civil War and Reconstruction in Arkansas.

The Reverend William H. Laird has deposited the Heth Papers (1763-1841) in the Virginia Room of the Library of the University of Virginia. The collection contains approximately four thousand manuscripts, being chiefly the letters, contracts, etc., of Colonel Harry Heth, dealing mainly with his coal business in Manchester, now a part of Richmond, during the years 1789-1841. There are interesting sidelights on the War of 1812 and on military affairs at the turn of the century. Notable items in the collection are letters from John Marshall, James Monroe, John Page, Edmund Randolph, and Thomas Mann Randolph. There is one letter from George Washington to Colonel Harry Heth.

The Dallas Historical Society, which maintains quarters at Southern Methodist University, has recently acquired a group of McKinney Papers containing several Collin McKinney letters, presented by Mr. W. B. Wilson; a photograph of I. B. Webb and data regarding his establishment of the first Methodist Church in Dallas County, presented by Miss Elizabeth Cox; items relating to Dr. A. D. Rice, mayor of Dallas in 1858, presented by Mrs. Henry Hamilton; the John N. Simpson collection (chiefly clippings on the history of Dallas banking), presented by Mr. Sloan Simpson; papers of Willis Stewart, an official of the Texas Land and Emigration Company, presented by Mr. W. P. Stewart; a collection of programs and souvenirs of important occasions in Dallas, presented by President G. B. Dealey; a group of photographs of the Dallas flood in 1908, presented by Mrs. A. L. Dennis; a complete set of H. H. Bancroft's histories and forty books dealing with the Civil War from the library of Colonel J. T. Trezevant, presented by Mrs. Rue O'Neill, a director of the Society; a bound file of *Harper's Weekly*, 1861-1865, 1898, presented by Mr. and Mrs. J. A. Somerville; the rare books and transcripts of old news files secured in preparation of the recently published *Sam Bass*, presented by the author, Wayne Gard. Among the many interesting single items which have been donated are several old city directories; a scrapbook of theater programs of the 1890's, presented by Mr. Karl Hoblitzelle; the minutes of the Dallas Jockey Club of 1869, presented by L. B. McCoy; Dallas census of 1868 and a *Law Register*

of 1869, presented by Judge W. A. Rhea; and several items relating to the history of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Texas.

Regional directors of the Survey of Federal Archives in the Southern states have been instructed to examine the records of Federal courts, 1861-1865, to ascertain whether they contain records of Confederate States courts. The records of other Federal agencies, for the Civil War period, as customhouses, naval stations, army posts, land offices, etc., are also being examined to determine whether they contain material of value for a history of the Confederacy. Of unusual interest to those attending the Nashville meeting of the Association will be the discussion by Dr. Philip M. Hamer, national director, of the materials for the history of the South, especially those relating to the Confederacy, located by the Survey.

At the request of Mr. Eugene Kessler, district director of the Department of Labor in New Orleans, Mr. Stanley C. Arthur, regional director of the Survey of Federal Archives for Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi, has detailed a group of workers, who had previously surveyed the records of the Department of Labor in New Orleans, to compile an alphabetical index of all aliens who have been naturalized in the New Orleans district since 1906. This index is based upon approximately 22,000 files of records in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization.

The Decline of States' Rights (Dallas: Southern Methodist University, 1936, pp. 32), by James Ernest Pate, is Vol. IV, no. 4, of the *Arnold Foundation Studies in Public Affairs*. After presenting "the problem of States' Rights versus the extension of federal control, Professor Pate traces the history of the doctrine through the period of the Civil War and Reconstruction. In a second section he recounts the efforts to protect the reserved powers of the states since 1865 and analyzes the principal decisions of the Supreme Court involving this principle. His third section deals with the federal-aid system as a means of extending federal control, and the fourth section describes the effect of economic crisis in recent years upon the division between federal and state powers. The concluding section surveys several groups of commentators upon the New Deal legislation and states the need for an extension of federal control to cope with modern economic problems of national scope."

The Story of the Wilmington Rebellion (Wilmington, N. C.: the Author, 1936, pp. 32, \$1.00), by Harry Hayden, is an "account of the Wilmington Revolution of 1898, which resulted in the elimination of the Negro as a political factor in Wilmington and North Carolina and which led to the disfranchisement of the race throughout the South through the instrumentality of the 'Grandfather Clause.' "

Cheever, Lincoln, and the Causes of the Civil War (Worcester, Mass.: Privately Printed, 1936, pp. 83), by George I. Rockwood, embraces a paper

read at the Boston meeting of the American Antiquarian Society, April 15, 1936. "It recites the main facts in the life of the abolitionist clergyman, George Barrell Cheever, and the train of events, with Cheever's part in them, which led to the election of Lincoln, secession and the Civil War." "Although causes other than religious feeling co-operated," the writer concludes, "nevertheless the war—which was against all the material interests of the North—was the direct result of the election of Lincoln, which itself resulted from the preaching of the abolitionists, of whom Garrison, Cheever, Beecher, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Whittier and, in his heart, Lincoln himself, were outstanding; and, at the crisis, Cheever carried the load" (p. 83).

West Virginia University has issued its *First Report of the Archivist of the Division of Documents . . . For the year 1935-1936, with a Descriptive List of Manuscript Collections* (Morgantown: West Virginia University Bulletin, Ser. 37, No. 1-11 [April, 1936], pp. 24). The archivist, Dr. Festus P. Summers, surveys the movement inaugurated during recent years at the University for the assembling, organizing, and preserving of manuscript materials. Appendix A lists important private collections acquired by the Division of Documents, including those of Jonathan M. Bennett, Charles M. Bishop, William G. Brown, Johnson Newlon Camden, Archibald W. Campbell, Henry Gassaway Davis, William Ewin, William E. Glasscock, Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson, Joseph Johnson, Francis H. Pierpont, James Porter, and Waitman T. Willey. Appendix B lists public records from Monongalia, Ohio, and Brooke counties deposited during the past two years.

The Tall Sycamore of the Wabash: Daniel Wolsey Voorhees (Boston: Bruce Humphries, Inc., 1936, pp. 155, \$2.00), by Leonard S. Kenworthy, is a biographical study of an Indiana Democrat who played a significant rôle in the Northwest and at Washington during the Civil War and its aftermath. Descended from ancestors who had lived in Maryland, Kentucky, and southern Ohio, it was only natural that he should assume a tolerant attitude toward institutions of the South and that he would oppose a war of emancipation. Voorhees denied membership in the Knights of the Golden Circle, and the writer finds no accurate and conclusive evidence that he was associated with that organization: "If he was a member, it is certain that he did not actively participate in its activities or help formulate its policies" (p. 69). Voorhees served in Congress from 1861 to 1873 with the exception of the years 1866-1869, and in the Senate from 1877 to 1897.

The Birmingham-Southern College *Bulletin*, Vol. XXIX, no. 3 (May, 1936), embraces *Congressional Redistricting of the Solid South* (pp. 38), by Hubert Searcy. The material for the study was drawn from newspapers, periodicals, government documents, and from "correspondence with those who were in direct touch with the situation in each of the various states." The writer

delineates the Solid South as ten states: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. The redistricting resulted from an act of 1929 which provided "for automatic reapportionment following each decennial census."

Articles on the Upper South: "Governor Horatio Sharpe Retires," by Paul H. Giddens, in the *Maryland Historical Review* (September); "George Rogers Clark's Relief Claims," by Temple Bodley, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (July); "The Taverns of Old Petersburg, Virginia," by Oscar F. Northington, Jr., "Historical Methods Used in the Development of Colonial National Monument," by B. Floyd Flickinger, "Constitutional Democracy in Ante-Bellum Virginia," by A. A. Rogers, "Some Neglected Aspects of the American Civil War: Recollections of John C. Wade," recorded by Robert Douthat Meade, and "Reverend Philip Slaughter," by Jane Chapman Slaughter, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly* (July); "The Site of the First Eventful Failure of Lord Cornwallis," by James M. Owens, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July); "Founding the North Carolina Asylum for the Insane," by Margaret Callender McCulloch, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July); "The Missouri Indians," by J. Brewton Berry, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (September); "Missouri in the Spanish American War," Part I, by Ruby Weedell Waldeck, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July); "Frank H. Greer," by Joseph B. Thoburn, and "Oklahoma's First College, Old High Gate, at Norman," by O. A. Kinchen, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (September).

Documents and compilations on the Upper South: "Letters of a Maryland Medical Student in Philadelphia and Edinburgh (1782-1784)," edited by Dorothy Mackay Quynn and William Rogers Quynn, "New Rinehart Letters," edited by William Sener Rusk, "Baltimore County Land Records of 1682," contributed by Louis Dow Scisco, "State of Maryland in 1798," "Maryland Notes from Virginia Records," contributed by Louis A. Burgess, and "Muster Roll of 'A' Company under the Command of Captain John Owings, 1812-1814," contributed by Milton P. Owings, in the *Maryland Historical Review* (September); "Notes From the Records of Stafford County, Virginia, Order Books," continued, "Edmund Randolph's Essay on the Revolutionary History of Virginia, 1774-1782," continued, "Diary of Col. William Bolling of Bolling Hall," continued, notes by R. A. Lancaster, Jr., and "Letters from Old Trunks [Letters to Col. James P. Marshall]," in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July); "Some Notes on Berkeley Springs, West Virginia," compiled by Katherine M. Hunter and Bernard E. Hunter, "A Letter from Alexander H. Stephens to Dr. George W. Bagby," contributed by W. Herman Bell, "Letters of William Tatham," continued, edited by Elizabeth Gregory McPherson, "The Henkel Family of New Market, Va., Early Printers in the Shenandoah Valley," by Albert Sydney Edmonds, and "Ann Hill Carter," by Cazemore G. Lee, Jr.,

in the *William and Mary College Quarterly* (July) ; "A Bibliography of North Carolina Imprints, 1761-1800," Part III, compiled by Douglas Crawford McMurtrie, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July) ; "Joel Watkins' Diary of 1789," edited by Virginia Smith Herold, and "The Letters of James Taylor to the Presidents of the United States," continued, edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July) ; "Governor Shelby's Army in the River Thames Campaign," edited by Milo M. Quaife, and "Reverend John D. Shane's Notes on Interviews, in 1844, with Mrs. Hinds and Patrick Scott of Bourbon County," transcribed by Lucien Beckner, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July) .

Articles on the Lower South: "Darien a Symbol of Defiance and Achievement," by Bessie Mary Lewis, "The Arrival of the Scotch Highlanders at Darien," by G. Arthur Gordon, "The Spanish Era in Georgia History," by J. Randolph Anderson, "Oglethorpe's Home at Frederica," by M. H. and D. B. Floyd, and "The Settlement of the Scotch Highlanders at Darien," by Alexander R. MacDonell, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September) ; "The Fortifications at San Marcos de Apalache," by Mark F. Boyd, and "Some Experiences of Bishop Young," by Edgar Legare Pennington, in the *Florida Historical Society Quarterly* (July) ; "Governor Perier's Expedition Against the Natchez Indians," by John A. Green, "Cabarets of New Orleans in the French Colonial Period," by the late Henry P. Dart, "The Development of Education in Louisiana Prior to Statehood," by Martin Luther Riley, and "Women in Public Affairs in Louisiana During Reconstruction," by Kathryn Reinhart Schuler, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July) ; "La Reunion, A French Colony in Texas," by W. J. Hammond, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (September) ; "Prince Solms's Trip to Texas, 1844-1845," by R. L. Bieseke, "The Free Negro in the Republic of Texas," Part II, by Harold Schoen, "The Mercer Colony in Texas, 1844-1883," Part II, by Nancy Ethie Eagleton, and "Mexican Land Grants in the Arkansas Valley," by J. O. Van Hook, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July) ; "Oliver Loving, Pioneer Drover of Texas," by Madeline Meyercord, in the *Southwest Review* (April) .

Documents and compilations on the Lower South: "The Spaniards and the English Settlement in Charles Town," continued, edited by José Miguel Gallardo, "Inscriptions from the Grave-Stones at Stoney Creek Cemetery near Yemassee, Beaufort County, S. C.," contributed by Mabel Runnette, and "The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jervey, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July) ; "Letters from East Florida," edited by Dorothy Dodd, and "The Panton, Leslie Papers: William Panton to John Forbes," continued, transcribed by Mrs. John W. Greenslade, in the *Florida Historical Society Quarterly* (July) ; "Account of the Credit and Debit of the Funds of the City of New

Orleans for the Year 1789," edited by the late Henry P. Dart, translated by Laura L. Porteous, "The Experiences of a Federal Soldier in Louisiana in 1863," edited by L. Carroll Root, introduction by Walter Prichard, "Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana," LXVIII, continued, translated by Heloise H. Cruzat, marginal notes by Henry P. Dart, revised by Walter Prichard, and "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana," LXX, continued, translated by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).

General and regional articles and compilations: "The Homestead Act and the Labor Surplus," by Fred A. Shannon, and "Status of the Ex-Confederate States as Seen in the Readmission of United States Senators," by R. Earl McClendon, in the *American Historical Review* (July); "The Singing South: Folk-Song in Recent Fiction Describing Southern Life," by Arthur Palmer Hudson, in the *Sewanee Review* (July-September); "Some Considerations on the Safety Valve Doctrine," by Murray Kane, "An Interpretation of the Statehood Process, 1800 to 1850," by Bayrd Still, "Western Attitude toward National Banks, 1873-74," by George L. Anderson, and "The Essay on *Habeas Corpus* in the Judge Sharkey Papers," edited by F. Garvin Davenport, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September); "Women in the Founding of the Southern Colonies," by Julia Cherry Spruill, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July); "Stormy Days in Court—The Booth Case," by Joseph Shafer, in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (September); "Jefferson's 'Pursuit of Happiness' and Some Forgotten Men," Part I, by Herbert Lawrence Ganter, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly* (July).

CONTRIBUTORS

WALTER B. POSEY is professor of history at Birmingham-Southern College.

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR. is Major in the 372d Engineer GS Regiment.

CHARLES R. WILSON is assistant professor of history at Colgate University.

RICHARD R. STENBERG is assistant professor of history at Edinburg Junior College, Edinburg, Texas.

FLETCHER M. GREEN is professor of history at the University of North Carolina.

The SOUTHERN REVIEW

... a competence almost wholly unrivalled at the moment in American magazines ... the promise given by these early contributors makes imperative the attention of all intelligent readers to the *Review's* future issues.

—*Poetry: A Magazine of Verse*

The *Review* not only looks exceedingly well—perhaps the handsomest of the quarterlies or monthlies—but keeps such a high standard that I wonder how you do it.

—*John T. Flynn*

I warmly congratulate you upon the excellence of *The Southern Review*. Its form and contents are a great delight ... To have so important a review printed in the South gives me a sort of satisfaction which I suppose only a man of Southern birth could have, although I welcome the *Review* as a national, as well as a sectional, contribution to culture.

—*Newton D. Baker*

... promises to become one of the distinguished publications of this country. Beautifully designed and printed, edited with taste and discernment. ...

—*The New Republic*

In the Autumn issue:

Party Platforms: A Study of the Nominating Conventions, *Herbert Agar*

Neutrality, *Edwin Borchard*

John Dewey, *Henry Bamford Parkes*

Literature and Economics, *Allen Tate*

The Later Poetry of W. B. Yeats,

R. P. Blackmur

Southern Employers and Labor Reform, *Virginius Dabney*

FICTION

Here Lies One, *S. S. Field*

Wm. Crane, *Manson Radford*

The Face, *Louis Moreau*

Silence, *Raymond Dannenbaum*

POETRY

The poem or group of poems winning the poetry prize offered by *The Southern Review* will be printed in the Autumn issue. The judges are *Allen Tate* and *Mark Van Doren*.

Discussions of new books by *Crane Brinton*, *Frederick L. Schuman*, *John Crowe Ransom*, *Cleanth Brooks, Jr.*, and *Broadus Mitchell*.

Coming:

T. S. Eliot and Dante, *Mario Praz*

Eugene O'Neill, *Bonamy Dobree*

William James, *John Dewey*

Editor: Charles W. Pipkin

Managing Editors: Cleanth Brooks, Jr. and Robert Penn Warren

Published Quarterly

at the Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.

One Year, \$3.00

Two Years, \$5.00

Virginia Historical Society

Organized 1831 - Chartered 1834

JOHN STEWART BRYAN President

MORGAN P. ROBINSON . . Recording Secretary



Part of Contents October, 1936, Issue:

ACCOUNT OF EARLY LOG HOUSES.

SOME UNPUBLISHED LETTERS written by Mrs.
Robert E. Lee.

COPY OF STAFFORD COUNTY ORDER BOOK,
1664.

DIARY of Colonel William Bolling, annotated (con-
tinued).

GENEALOGICAL articles on the Champe, Michaux,
Whitehead and Pendleton families.

Book Reviews, notes and queries.



ANNUAL DUES \$5.00; Life Membership \$100.00

Today . . . Write

ROBERT A. LANCASTER, Jr., Cor. Sec'y

707 East Franklin Street - Richmond, Virginia

The VIRGINIA QUARTERLY REVIEW

Some Contributors:

Conrad Aiken
Hervey Allen
Sherwood Anderson
Katharine Anthony
Newton D. Baker
Charles A. Beard
Phyllis Bottome
Claude G. Bowers
Ernest Boyd
Gamaliel Bradford
Roark Bradford
William Cabell Bruce
James Branch Cabell
R. P. Tristram Coffin
William E. Dodd
John Drinkwater
Raymond B. Fosdick
Waldo Frank
Robert Frost
Andre Gide
Julian Green
de Roulhac Hamilton
Archibald Henderson
Laurence Housman
Aldous Huxley
Gerald Johnson
Mary Johnston
Walter de la Mare
D. H. Lawrence
Salvador de Madariaga
Thomas Mann
Andre Maurois
Broadus Mitchell
Albert Jay Nock
Luigi Pirandello
John Crowe Ransom
Morley Roberts
Bertrand Russell
Archibald Rutledge
Carl Sandburg
Arthur Symons
John Donald Wade
Hugh Walpole
Stark Young
Stefan Zweig

The New York Times says, "It has won a high and honorable place among American Periodicals."

The Boston Evening Transcript says, "It holds a place of distinction not easily won but now acknowledged everywhere."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch says, "The Prometheans of the pen have appeared in its pages."

The Baltimore Evening Sun says, "It has commanded the respect of distinguished people wherever good writing in English is appreciated."

To Be Published in Early Issues:

"The Trumpet" . A story by Walter de la Mare
"The Roosevelt Administration"

by Walter Millis

"Serenade in Mexico" . . . by Carleton Beals

"The Right of Sanctuary" . by Garrard Glenn

"Belief and Poetry" by Allen Tate

"Dante, Anticlerical" . . . by Cuthbert Wright

"Surplus Value" by Scott Buchanan

"The Limits of Regionalism" . by H. C. Nixon

THE VIRGINIA QUARTERLY REVIEW

ONE WEST RANGE, UNIVERSITY, VA.

GENTLEMEN:

Please enter my subscription for ^{one year}~~two years~~ beginning with the current issue (\$3.00 a year, or for two years \$5.00, special rate).

Name.....

Address.....

William and Mary College Quarterly

Devoted to the publication of
original contributions and
documents relating to
Virginia history

\$1.00 A COPY . . . \$4.00 A YEAR



THOROUGHLY INDEXED

Published Quarterly by
William and Mary College
at WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Editors

JOHN STEWART BRYAN
President of William and
Mary College

E. G. SWEM
Librarian, William and
Mary College

Now Available . . .
BACK NUMBERS

The JOURNAL of SOUTHERN HISTORY

\$3.00 A VOLUME
(Unbound)
75c A NUMBER . . .

ALSO AVAILABLE . . . LIMITED NUMBER

REPRINTS of ARTICLES

FROM VOLUME ONE AT
25c EACH, Postage Prepaid

Today . . . Write to

**The JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
BATON ROUGE, LA.**

Send Subscriptions and Renewals to

FLETCHER M. GREEN, Sec.-Treas.
Emory University - - - Atlanta, Georgia

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PRESENTS THE WORKS
OF TWO OUTSTANDING HISTORIANS

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY *1860-1896*

BY WALTER L. FLEMING

IN THIS BOOK, the late Dr. Fleming, eminent Southern historian, has presented more than the history of an educational institution. He has broadened the scope of his work to include the development of education in Louisiana, beginning with the

Church schools under French régime and continuing through Reconstruction; and, drawing upon this rich background, the author has woven into his story much of the social and political life of the Old South.
499 pages \$3.00

A HISTORY *OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION* VOL. I

BY CHARLES EDWARD SMITH

PROFESSOR SMITH, of the Louisiana State University faculty, has brought together the experience of years of research and of classroom teaching in the production of this work. In this first volume are presented in broad outlines the shifting centers of Western power, from the Egyptian through the cultures of the Near East, the

Grecian, the Roman, and the period of the Middle Ages. It is designed to furnish for the beginning student of history a wide basis of reference, complete in major divisions rather than detailed, to assist him in the orientation of his further studies.

519 pages *Illustrated* \$3.00

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

RURAL SOCIOLOGY

Devoted to *Scientific Study* of Rural Life

Rural Sociology is published by the Section on Rural Sociology of the American Sociological Society. Louisiana State University is its Guarantor.

Contents of the September, 1936 Issue:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <i>Exceptions to the Uniformity of a Lower Natural Increase of the Upper Classes.</i> By Corrado Gini. | <i>Some Observations on Oklahoma Population Movements Since 1930.</i> By Robert T. McMillan. |
| <i>Historical Background of California Farm Labor.</i> By Paul S. Taylor and Tom Vasey. | <i>Forms and Problems of Culture-Integration and Methods of Their Study. Part II.</i> By Pitirim A. Sorokin. |
| <i>Social Attitudes of the Czechoslovakian Peasant.</i> By Antonín Obrdlík. | Current Bulletins. By Charles P. Loomis. |
| <i>Rural Educational Institutions and Social Lag.</i> By Roland R. Renne. | Book Reviews. |
| <i>Some Characteristics of Rural Families on Relief in New York.</i> By W. A. Anderson. | News Notes and Announcements. |
| | Books Received. |

Manuscripts, communications for the editors, and business correspondence should be addressed to T. Lynn Smith, Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The subscription price is \$2.00 per year; single copies, 50 cents each.

PUBLICATION WORK Our Specialty!

Make Use of
Our

ART
Dep't

●

OF COURSE, printing of all sorts is our profession, but somehow we have selected, or rather feel that, publication work is our specialty.

When we finish a job of this kind, it bears those finer qualities that only a progressive and painstaking printing establishment can impress.

Our up-to-date shop, our gifted craftsmen—real artists at their work—enable us to give you the finest printing available—yet you pay no more for it!



The **FRANKLIN PRESS, Inc.**

PHONE 195 216 MAIN ST. BATON ROUGE, LA.